

A TENTH-CENTURY DOCUMENT
OF ARABIC LITERARY THEORY
AND CRITICISM

The sections on poetry of al-Bâqillânî's

I'jâz al-Qur'ân

translated and annotated

GUSTAVE E. VON GRUNEBAUM



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

PJ610
E5
1950

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, CHICAGO 37
Cambridge University Press, London, N.W.1, England
W. J. Gage & Co., Limited, Toronto 2B, Canada

*Published 1950. Composed and printed in Germany by J.J. Augustin
Glückstadt*

404380

PREFACE

The Arab critic holds one of the principal clues to the understanding of the aims and means of Arabic writing. Not only does his conceptual and terminological apparatus reflect the educated Arab's interpretation and appraisal of his literature and indicate the extent to which he has succeeded in rationalizing his taste; it also proves a dependable guide toward the origin of his attitudes and ideas, be they genuinely Arab or inherited from other cultural traditions.

Unfortunately most Arab theorists and critics confine their efforts to illustrating their analyses of the means of literary presentation by commenting on individual lines or at best brief passages. Moreover, a large majority of such critical observations is scattered among a great number of works not primarily devoted to criticism.

The fact that Bâqillânî, in the course of his inquiry into the nature of the uniqueness of the Koran, first studies the stylistic tools of the Arab writers and then offers an elaborate verse by verse analysis of two recognized masterpieces of Arabic poetry, and the additional fact that he conducts his study from an aesthetical rather than a grammatical viewpoint, bestows extraordinary significance on his discussion. Indeed, accessible Arabic literature does not provide any parallels to Bâqillânî's undertaking.

The pioneering character of Bâqillânî's investigation together with its comparatively early date enhance the importance of the text even as they increase its difficulties. I owe a great debt of gratitude to the unfailing encouragement and advice of the regretted scholar to whose memory this translation is dedicated.

The manuscript was finished in 1944 and thoroughly revised in 1946-48 and again in 1950.

University of Chicago

G. E. VON GRUNEBaum

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- Adab* = Ibn Qutaiba, *Adab al-kâtib*, ed. M. Grünert, Leiden, 1900.
- Agânî* = Abû 'l-Faraj al-Işfahânî, *Kitâb al-agânî*, Bûlâq, 1285 (vols. 1—20); vol. 21, ed. R. E. Brünnow, Leiden, 1888.
- Agânî*³ = the same, 3rd ed., Cairo, 1927 ff.
- 'Alqama = 'Alqama b. 'Abada, quoted from: *The Divans of the Six Ancient Arabic Poets*, ed. W. Ahlwardt, London, 1870.
- Amâlî* = Abû 'Alî al-Qâlî, *Amâlî*, Bûlâq, 1324.
- Âmidî* = al-Âmidî, *Kitâb al-muwâzana baina Abî Tammâm wa'l-Buhturî*, Constantinople 1287.
- 'Antara = 'Antara b. Šaddâd, quoted from: *The Divans ...*, ed. Ahlwardt, London, 1870.
- Anbârî = Abû Muḥammad al-Qâsim b. Muḥammad al-Anbârî, *Commentary of the Mufaḍḍaliyyât*, ed. C. J. Lyall, Oxford, 1921.
- Asrâr* = 'Abdalqâhir al-Jurjânî, *Asrâr al-balâğa*, Cairo, 1320.
- Azmina* = al-Marzûqî, *Kitâb al-azmina wa'l-amkina*, Ḥaidarâbâd, 1332.
- Badî'* = 'Abdallâh b. al-Mu'tazz, *Kitâb al-badî'*, ed. I. Kratchkovsky, London, 1935.
- Bayân* = al-Jâḥiẓ, *Kitâb al-bayân wa't-tabẓîn*, Cairo, 1351.
- BB* = Baššâr b. Burd, *Selection of his works* by the brothers al-Ḥâlidî, with cmt. by at-Tujîbî, Aligarh, 1934/1353.
- BuhtHamâsa* = al-Buhturî, *Kitâb al-ḥamâsa*, ed. L. Cheikho, Beirut, 1911.
- Dalâ'il* = 'Abdalqâhir al-Jurjânî, *Dalâ'il al-i'jâz*, Cairo, 1331.
- DM* = Abû Hilâl al-'Askarî, *Dîwân al-ma'ânî*, Cairo, 1352.
- EI* = *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Leiden, 1913—34.
- Fawâ'id* = Ibn Qayyim al-Jauziyya, *Kitâb al-fawâ'id*, Cairo, 1327/1909.
- Fihrist* = Muḥammad an-Nadîm, *Kitâb al-fihrist*, ed. G. Flügel, Leipzig, 1871—72.
- GAL* = C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, Weimar, 1897—1902. Supplement, Leiden, 1937—42.
- Ġufrân* = Abû 'l-'Alâ' al-Ma'arrî, *Risâlat al-ġufrân*, ed. K. Kîlânî, Cairo, 1343/1925.
- Ḥamâsa* = Abû Tammâm, *Ḥamâsa*, ed. G. W. Freytag, Bonn, 1828—51.
- Ḥâşş* = at-Ta'âlibî, *Kitâb ḥâşş al-ḥâşş*, Cairo, 1326/1908.
- Ḥaṭṭâbî* = Ḥamd b. Muḥammad al-Ḥaṭṭâbî, *Kitâb bayân i'jâz al-Qur'ân*. Ms. Leiden 1654 (Cod. 655 Warner). ff. 1a—44a.
- Ḥayawân* = al-Jâḥiẓ, *Kitâb al-ḥayawân*, Cairo, 1325/1907.
- Ḥizâna* = 'Abdalqâdir al-Baġdâdî, *Ḥizânat al-adab*, Bûlâq, 1299.
- Ḥuṣrî* = al-Ḥuṣrî, *Zahr al-âdâb*. On margin of 'Iqd, Cairo, 1321.
- IA* = Diyâ' ad-Dîn Ibn al-Aṭîr, *al-Maṭal as-sâ'ir*, Cairo, 1312.
- Îdâh* = al-Ḥaṭîb al-Qazwînî, *Kitâb al-îdâh*. Together with Taftazânî, *Muhtaşar*.
- IḤaldûn* = Ibn Ḥaldûn, *Prolegomena*, ed. É. Quatremère, Paris, 1858; trans. W. MacG. de Slane, Paris, 1862—68.
- IḤallikân* = Ibn Ḥallikân, *Wafayât al-a'yân*, Cairo, 1892; trans. W. MacG. de Slane, Paris, 1843—71.
- I'jâz* = al-Bâqillânî, *I'jâz al-Qur'ân*, Cairo, 1349.

- Imru'ulqais = Imru'ulqais b. Ḥujr, quoted from: *The Divans* ..., ed. W. Ahlwardt, London, 1870.
- Imtā'* = Abū Ḥayyān at-Tauḥidī, *Kitāb el-imtā' wa'l-mu'ānasa*, edd. Aḥmad Amīn & Aḥmad az-Zain, Cairo, 1939—44.
- IMudabbir = Ibrāhīm b. al-Mudabbir, *ar-Risālat al-'adā'*, ed. Z. Mubārak, Cairo, 1350/1931.
- Iqd* = Ibn 'Abdrabbihī, *al-'Iqd al-farīd*, Cairo, 1353/1935.
- Iqtidāb* = al-Baṭalyausī, *al-Iqtidāb fī šarḥ Adab al-kuttāb*, Beirut, 1901.
- Iršād* = Yāqūt, *Iršād al-arīb*, ed. D. S. Margoliouth, 2nd ed., London, 1923—31.
- IšajḤamāsa* = Ibn aš-Šajari, *Ḥamāsa*, Haidarābād, 1345.
- IŠaraf = Ibn Šaraf al-Qairawānī, *Rasā'il* (sic; correct title probably *Masā'il*) *al-intiqād*. In: M. Kurd 'Alī, *Rasā'il al-bulagā'*, 3rd ed., Cairo, 1946, 311—43. Translated (in part) by Ch. Pellat, *Bulletin des Etudes Arabes* (Algiers), VIII (1948), 233—40; IX (1949), 38—48. 87—96.
- Itqān* = as-Suyūṭī, *Kitāb al-itqān fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān*, Cairo, 1318/1900.
- Kāmil* = al-Mubarrad, *al-Kāmil*, ed. W. Wright, Leipzig, 1864—1892.
- Kašf* = aš-Šāhib Ismā'il b. 'Abbād, *al-Kašf 'an masāwī šī'r al-Mutanabbī*, Cairo, 1349.
- Kaškūl* = al-'Āmilī, *Kaškūl*, Būlāq, 1288/1871.
- LA = Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'Arab*, Būlāq, 1300—1307.
- Lane = E. W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, London and Edinburgh, 1863—93.
- Mafātīḥ* = al-Ḥwārizmī, *Mafātīḥ al-'ulūm*, ed. G. van Vloten, Leiden, 1895.
- Mağribī = Ibn Ya'qūb al-Mağribī, *Mawāhib al-fattāḥ fī šarḥ Talḥīs al-miftāḥ*. Together with Taftazānī, *Muḥtaṣar*.
- Mašārī'* = Ja'far b. Aḥmad as-Sarrāj, *Kitāb mašārī' al-'uṣṣāq*, Constantinople, 1301.
- Mas'ūdī = al-Mas'ūdī, *Murūj ad-dahab*, ed. Barbier de Meynard and Pavet de Courteille, Paris, 1861—77.
- Mehren = A. F. Mehren, *Die Rhetorik der Araber*, Kopenhagen and Vienna, 1853.
- MM = *Majmū'at al-ma'ānī*, Constantinople, 1301.
- Mufaddaliyyāt* = al-Mufaddal ad-Dabbī, *al-Mufaddaliyyāt*, ed. and trans. C. J. Lyall, Oxford, 1918—21.
- Muḥāḍarāt* = ar-Rāğib al-Iṣfahānī, *Muḥāḍarāt al-udabā'*, Cairo, 1326.
- Mukāṭara* = at-Tayālisī, *al-Mukāṭara*, ed. R. Geyer, *SBWA*, phil.-hist. Kl., CCIII (1927), Abh. 4.
- Muntaḥal* = at-Ta'ālibī, *al-Muntaḥal*, Alexandria, 1319/1901.
- Murtadā = as-Sayyid Murtadā, *Kitāb al-amālī*, Cairo, 1325.
- Mustatraf* = al-Ibšaiḥī, *Kitāb al-mustatraf*, Cairo, 1896/1314.
- Mu'talif* = al-Āmidī, *al-Mu'talif wa'l-muḥtalif* (together with al-Marzubānī, *Mu'jam aš-šu'arā'*), ed. F. Krenkow, Cairo, 1354.
- Muwaššā* = al-Waššā', *Kitāb al-muwaššā*, ed. R. E. Brünnow, Leiden, 1886.
- Muwaššah* = al-Marzubānī, *Kitāb al-muwaššah*, Cairo, 1343.
- Muzhir* = as-Suyūṭī, *al-Muzhir fī 'ulūm al-luḡa*, Būlāq, 1282.
- Nābiga = an-Nābiga 'd-Dubyanī, quoted from: *The Divans* ..., ed. W. Ahlwardt, London, 1870.
- Naqā'id* = *The Naqā'id of Jarīr and al-Farazdaq*, ed. A. A. Bevan, Leiden, 1905—12.

- NN = Qudâma b. Ja'far, *Naqd an-naṭr*, ed. T. Hussain and 'A. H. El-Abbâdi, Cairo, 1933.
- Nuwairî = Šihâb ad-Dîn an-Nuwairî, *Nihâyat al-arab*, Cairo, 1922 ff.
- Qânûn = Abû Tâhir al-Baġdâdî, *Qânûn al-balâġa*. In: M. Kurd 'Alî, *Rasâ'il al-bulâġâ*, 3rd ed., Cairo, 1946, pp. 408—68.
- Qazwînî = al-Ḥaṭîb al-Qazwînî, *Talhîş al-Miftâh*. Together with Taftazânî, *Muhtaşar*.
- Qudâma = Qudâma b. Ja'far, *Naqd aš-ši'r*, Cairo, 1352/1934.
- Qurâda = Ibn Rašîq al-Qairawânî, *Qurâdat ad-dahab*, Cairo, 1926/1344.
- Râzî = Fahr ad-Dîn ar-Râzî, *Nihâyat al-ijâz fî dirâyat al-i'jâz*, Cairo, 1317.
- Rescher = O. Rescher, *Abriss der arabischen Literaturgeschichte*, Stuttgart, 1925—33.
- Rummânî = 'Alî b. 'Îsâ ar-Rummânî, *Kitâb an-nukat fî i'jâz al-Qur'ân*, ed. Dr. 'Abd al-'Alîm, Delhi, 1934.
- Šadâqa = Abû Ḥayyân al-Tauḥîdî, *Risâla fî 'ş-šadâqa wa's-šadîq*, Constantinople, 1301.
- Šafadî = aš-Šafadî, *Kitâb jinân al-jinâs fî 'ilm al-badî'*, Constantinople, 1299/1882.
- Sakkâkî = as-Sakkâkî, *Kitâb miftâh al-'ulûm*, Cairo, n. d. (ca. 1898).
- Šams = Šams-i Qais, *al-Mu'jam fi ma'âyir aš'âr al-'Ajam*, ed. Muḥammad Qazwînî, Leiden and London, 1909.
- Šarḥ al-maḍnûn = 'Ubaidallâh b. 'Abdalmajîd al-'Ubaidî, *Šarḥ al-maḍnûn*, Cairo, 1913.
- ŠawInd = E. Bräunlich and A. Fischer, *Schawâhid-Indices*, Leipzig, 1934 ff.
- Šin = Abû Hilâl al-'Askarî, *Kitâb aš-šinâ'atain*, Constantinople, 1320.
- Ši'r = Ibn Qutaiba, *Kitâb aš-ši'r wa's-šu'arâ'*, ed. M. J. de Goeje, Leiden, 1904.
- Sirr = Ibn Sinân al-Ḥafâjî, *Sirr al-fašâha*, Cairo, 1932.
- Subḥ = al-Qalqaşandî, *Subḥ al-a'sâ*, Cairo, 1913—19/1331—38.
- Subkî = Bahâ' ad-Dîn as-Subkî, *Arûs al-afrâḥ fî šarḥ Talhîş al-miftâh*. Together with Taftazânî, *Muhtaşar*.
- Šûlî = Muḥammad b. Yaḥyâ aš-Šûlî, *Adab al-kuttâb*, Cairo 1341/1922.
- Šûlî, AT = Muḥammad b. Yaḥyâ aš-Šûlî, *Aḥbâr Abî Tammâm*, Cairo, 1937.
- Ṭabaqât = Ibn al-Mu'tazz, *Ṭabaqât aš-šu'arâ' al-muḥdalîn*, ed. A. Eghbal, London, 1939.
- Ṭabarî = Abû Ja'far Muḥammad b. Jarîr aṭ-Ṭabarî, *Annales*, ed. M. J. de Goeje, et al., Leiden, 1879—1901.
- Taftazânî = Sa'd ad-Dîn at-Taftazânî, *Muhtaşar at-Talhîş*, Cairo, 1342/1923.
- Ta'lab = Aḥmad b. Yaḥyâ Ta'lab, *Qawâ'id aš-ši'r*, ed. C. Schiaparelli, *Actes du VIII^e Congrès international des orientalistes*, Part II, Section I, 173—214, Leiden, 1893.
- Tamḥîd = al-Bâqillânî, *al-Tamḥîd fî 'r-radd 'alâ 'l-mulḥida ...*, edd. M. M. al-Ḥudairî and M. 'A. Abû Rîda, Cairo, 1366/1947.
- Tarafa = Tarafa b. al-'Abd, quoted from: *The Divans ...*, ed. W. Ahlwardt, London, 1870.
- Timâr = aṭ-Ta'âlibî, *Kitâb timâr al-qulûb*, Cairo, 1326/1908.
- Tirâz = Yaḥyâ b. Ḥamza al-Mu'ayyad bi'llâh, *aṭ-Tirâz li-asrâr al-balâġa wa-'ulûm ḥaqâ'iq al-i'jâz*, Cairo, 1332/1914.

- ‘*Umda* = Ibn Rašîq al-Qairawânî, *al-‘Umda*, Cairo, 1353/1934.
‘*Uyûn* = Ibn Qutaiba, ‘*Uyûn al-aḥbâr*, Cairo, 1343—48/1925—30.
Wasâta = ‘Alî al-Jurjânî, *Kitâb al-wasâta bain al-Mutanabbî wa-ḥuṣûmi-hi*,
edd. Muḥ. Abû ‘l-Faḍl Ibrâhîm & ‘Alî Muḥammad el-Bajânî, Cairo,
1364/1945.
Yâqût = Yâqût, *Mu‘jam al-buldân*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, Leipzig, 1866—73.
Yatîma = aṭ-Ta‘âlibî, *Yatîmat ad-dahr*, Damascus, n. d. (1886?).
Zahra = Muḥammad b. Dâwûd al-Iṣfahânî, *Kitâb az-Zahra*, ed. A. R.
Nykl and I. Tûqân, Chicago, 1932.
Zuhair = Zuhair b. abî Sulmâ, quoted from: *The Divans ...*, ed. W. Ahl-
wardt, London, 1870.

INTRODUCTION

Abû Bakr Muḥammad b. aṭ-Ṭayyib b. Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. al-Qâsim al-Bâqillânî,¹ a native of Baṣra and a resident of Baġdâd, was the leader of the Ašʿarite theologians of his day. Of his outward life little is known except that he was for a time Mâlikite *qâdî* in ʿUkbarâ,² on one occasion served as an ambassador to Byzantium for ʿAḍud ad-Daula,³ and that he died in Baġdâd on June 6, 1013.

He was active as a writer on theological subjects and especially as a controversialist, but what we know of his views has in the main to be compiled from only two of his books,⁴ since none of his works has become accessible with the exception of the *Tamhîd* and the *Iʿjâz al-Qurʾân*.⁵

Abdul Aleem has traced the early history of the *iʿjâz* problem listing the authors contributing to its development and analysing their major extant works.⁶ The discussion of the (miraculous) "uniqueness" of the Koran, its *iʿjâz*, acquired an interest exceeding the theological field when the question was raised whether the inimitability of the Holy Book

1. A. S. Tritton, *Muslim Theology*, London, 1947, p. 177, writes Ibn aṭ-Ṭib. Ibn Ḥallikân, trans. de Slane, II, 672, discusses the *nisba* and its correct spelling at some length. C. Brockelmann, *EI*, I, 603, and *GAL*, I, 197, gives the name erroneously as Abû Bakr ʿAlî b. aṭ-Ṭayyib al-Bâqillânî; *GAL*, Suppl., I, 349, Brockelmann follows Ibn Ḥallikân. Bâqillânî was, however, not as Brockelmann maintains a student of al-Ašʿarî himself—al-Ašʿarî died in 935—, but received his training from Abû ʿl-ʿAbbâs Ibn Mujâhid aṭ-Ṭâʾî, a direct disciple of the founder of the school. Cf. *Islamic Culture*, VII (1933), 75.

2. *Iršâd*, II, 1057. ʿUkbarâ is a township on the Tigris, about twenty miles due north from Baġdâd, in Bâqillânî's days noted for wine and certain industrial activities. For Bâqillânî's adherence to the Mâlikite rite, cf. *Tamhîd*, pp. 242f., and M. Schreiner, *ZDMG*, LII (1898), 487.

3. *GAL*, Suppl., I, 349, where references are listed. An anecdote connected with his visit to the Byzantine court is told by Ibn al-Jauzî, *Kitâb al-adkiyâ*, trans. O. Rescher, Galata, 1925, pp. 164—65. H. F. Amedroz, *JRAS*, 1914, 918—19, places the visit in the year 981/2.

As an appendix to the *Tamhîd* the editors published the vita of al-Bâqillânî by Qâdî ʿIyâd (d. 1149), followed by a list of his works consisting of 52 items (*Tamhîd*, pp. 242—56). Tauḥîdî, *Imtâʿ*, I, 143, presents a brief and unfriendly characteristic of Bâqillânî.

4. For his doctrines see M. Schreiner, *Actes du VIII^e Congrès international des orientalistes*, Leiden, 1893, I, 108—110; *Tamhîd*, Introduction, pp. 20—27; and especially, Tritton, *op. cit.*, pp. 177—82.

5. *GAL* Suppl., I 349, has four further titles of books preserved in manuscript but as yet unpublished.

6. *Islamic Culture*, VII (1933), 64ff. 215ff.

applied to its form as well as its contents. This aspect of the problem appears to have come to the fore sometime during the ninth century.⁷

The vindication of the matchless literary position of Revelation was more important to Islam than to Christianity because only the Muslim possessed the unmediated word of God. The Christian had his scriptures

7. *Fawā'id*, p. 178, refers to Ibn al-Muqaffa's (d. 757) attempt to match the Koran. When Ibn al-Muqaffa' arrived at the passage Sūra 11. 42—46 he realized that it was impossible for any human being to equal the Book. So he desisted from his *mu'arafa* and tore up what he had done. His contemporary, Jahm b. Ṣafwān (executed in 746), was known for his critical attitude to the Koran; cf. e.g., Tritton, *op. cit.*, pp. 62—3. In 781, Timothy, the Nestorian patriarch, was able to say before the caliph al-Mahdī (775—785) that the Koran had not been confirmed by a miracle without, apparently, being contradicted. Cf. J. W. Sweetman, *Islam and Christian Theology*, Part 1, I, London and Redhill, 1945, pp. 36—7.

*Ag*³, IV, 34, Abū 'l-'Atāhiya (d. 828), after reading Sūra 78, declares that he composed a *qaṣida* excelling the Koranic passage in beauty. His pious contemporary, Maṣṣūr b. 'Ammār, bases a charge of *zandaqa* on this statement. (On Maṣṣūr b. 'Ammār cf. al-Ḥaṭīb al-Baḡdādī, *Ta'rīḥ Baḡdād*, XIII, Cairo, 1931, pp. 71—79.) I. Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, Halle a. S., 1888—90, II, 401—404, discusses intended and attempted imitations of the Koran. For the so-called Koran of Abū 'l-'Alā' al-Ma'arrī (d. 1058) cf. A. Fischer, *Berichte d. Sächs. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl.*, XCIV/2, 1942, and the review by R. Hartmann, *ZDMG*, XCVIII (1944), 396—400.

It appears that only during the 9th century did criticism of the artistic qualities of the Koran come to be considered more and more improper for the true believer. Cf. the interesting passage, *Kāmil*, p. 485, where al-Mubarrad (d. 898) is at pains to refute a critic's objection to Koran 37.63, an objection—the *muṣabbah bihi* ought not to be less but more familiar than the *muṣabbah* which the critic alleges is not the case in the impugned verse—which, otherwise, is entirely consonant with the accepted principles of Arab literary criticism. *Imtā'*, III, 185, Tauḥīdī (d. 1009) gives preference to Koranic over current usage regarding the preposition with which a certain verb is to be construed.

Abdul Aleem, *loc. cit.*, 229—230, lists a number of poets who were critical of the Koran. *Ag*³, III, 211—12 and 215, might be added to his references; here Baṣṣār b. Burd (d. 783) rates some of his verses superior to Sūra 59. Toward the end of the 10th century the Ṣāhib Ibn 'Abbād could still publicly accept the compliment made him by a Jew from Iṣfahān that the style of the Koran was only slightly superior to his own; cf. *Irṣād*, II, 296—97.

Apollinaris the Younger (d. A. D. 390) reputedly composed 1000 psalms which he thought superior to those of David; cf. F. Haase, *Altchristl. Kirchengeschichte nach orient. Quellen*, Leipzig, 1925, 374. Haase quotes the *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian, i. e. Michael I, Patriarch of Antioch (d. 1199), ed. I. B. Chabot, Paris, 1900—1910, I, 275—76, as his authority, but nowhere in the book is there any mention of either the figure "1000" nor of the high opinion which Apollinaris is supposed to have cherished of his work.

in translation and had not been taught to look upon the original as actual discourse in the Lord's own tongue. Besides, the Bible could not escape being judged against the Graeco-Roman literary tradition while the Koran stood out in Arabic literature as an unprecedented phenomenon for the critical valuation of which no tried standard existed. Therefore, in Christianity, the ready admission of the formal imperfection of Scripture.⁸ On occasion the line would be taken (as was done, e.g., by St. Jerome [d. 420], Gregory the Great [d. 604] and Isidore of Seville [d. 636]) that, in Isidore's words, the *eloquium humile* of Scripture surpasses the *tumentem et ornatum sermonem* of the profane poets. Their discourse is resplendent with external, verbal eloquence, while Scripture is illuminated by the internal splendor of wisdom.⁹ The realization is essential that reverence for the Bible was not as necessarily wordbound as reverence for the Koran. Speaking of St. John the Almsgiver, patriarch of Alexandria, 611—619, his contemporary and biographer, Leontios of Neapolis (d. 668) says: "The saintly man had also a good knowledge of the holy Scriptures, not so much an accurate knowledge of the words through learning them by heart (which is but for vainglory), but by actually practising their precepts and keeping their commandments."¹⁰

These observations are not intended to deny the existence within Christianity of an attitude comparable to that displayed by the theologians of Islam. The Venerable Bede (d. 735), for example, looks upon the language of the Bible much like Bâqillânî does on the language of the Koran. In his treatise *De schematibus et tropis Sanctae Scripturae* Bede proposes to show that the images and figures of the Bible surpass in age and beauty anything offered by profane authors.¹¹ But it remained for the Victorines of the twelfth century to recognize the whole Bible as one supreme work of art, as a universal allegory whose linguistic and stylistic uniqueness is owed to its being the sole repository of highest Being, Truth and Beauty. The plastic work of art of the Universe is paralleled on the literary plane by the Bible—both God's masterpieces expressing in hieroglyphs and allegories the secret of the divine essence.

8. Cf. e. g. Cassiodorus (d. 585), *Institutiones*, I, 30, discussed by A. del Monte, *La parola del passato*, III (1948), 31. Many centuries later, Nikolaos of Methone (d. before 1165) could remove theological difficulties resulting from scriptural phraseology by brushing the wording aside as representing but the usual anthropomorphic manner of the Bible; cf. H. Beck, *Vorstellung und Vorherbestimmung in der theologischen Literatur der Byzantiner*, Rome, 1937, p. 216.

9. Cf. E. de Bruyne, *Études d'esthétique médiévale*, Brugge, 1946, I, 94.

10. E. Dawes and N. H. Baynes, *Three Byzantine Saints*, Oxford, 1948, p. 228.

11. De Bruyne, *op. cit.*, I, 157—58.

So the Bible emerges as the only fully significant work of literature and strictly speaking the only literary creation. No human writer can go beyond mediating and interpreting Scripture.¹² Islam has never been as bold or as consistent in its aesthetic conception of Revelation. The aesthetic considerations which from the 10th century onward were to maintain an important function in the theory of the *i'jâz* had started from an appreciation of Koranic style and never went beyond stylistic analysis.

The beginnings, of course, were not systematic. The Christian convert to Islam, 'Alî b. Rabban aṭ-Ṭabarî (d. ca. 864), asserts that he has never in any language found stylistic perfection equalling that of the Koran.¹³ Abû Ḥâtim as-Sijistânî (d. 864) concurs.¹⁴ Slightly later perhaps, al-Jâhîz (d. 869 or 870) composed a treatise on rhetorical peculiarities of the Koran, such as its succinct style (*i'jâz*), its metaphors (*isti'ârât*), etc.¹⁵ In discussing the difference of the Koran from any other literary work the term *i'jâz* does not seem to have been used by his time.¹⁶ At any rate, it

12. Cf. e.g. H. H. Glunz, *Die Literarästhetik des europäischen Mittelalters*, Bochum-Langendreer, 1937, pp. 166—85 and 574. The inclusion of the Biblical images and similes in the concept of the *icon* by John of Damascus (d. ca. 749) points in the same direction but the idea was never to be systematically developed in the Eastern Church. For John's view cf. G. Ostrogorsky, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites*, Breslau, 1929, p. 44.

13. *Kitâb ad-dîn wa'd-da'ula*, Cairo, 1923/1342, pp. 44—45; trans. A. Mingana, London—New York, 1922, pp. 50—51. His contemporary, al-Murdâr, maintained, however, that men could produce "something equal to or even better than" the Koran; cf. Tritton, *op. cit.*, p. 120. An-Nazzâm (d. 845/6) expressly excludes considerations of style from his reasons for the miraculous nature of the Holy Book (*ibid.*, p. 94).

14. I. Goldziher, *Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie*, Leiden, 1896—99, I, 151.

15. *Ḥayawân*, III, 26—27. It is presumably from this treatise that as-Suyûṭî (d. 1505), *Itqân*, II, 117—18, quotes an enthusiastic eulogy of the Holy Book in which most of the current theological arguments in favor of the *i'jâz* but not the term itself can be traced. In his pamphlet *fî ḍamm ahlâq al-kuttâb* Jâhîz rebukes the "secretaries" for their inclination to find fault with the Koran; cf. *Talât rasâ'il*, ed. J. Finkel, Cairo, 1344, pp. 42—43. See also O. Rescher, *Excerpte und Uebersetzungen aus den Schriften des Ġâhîz*, Stuttgart, 1931, I, 70. Concision, *i'jâz*, was valued as a scriptural virtue by St. Basil (d. 379); cf. the poignant passage, *Patrologia Graeca*, XXXI, 200 A.

16. Cf. *Bayân*, I, 294. He does, however, entitle the first chapter of his *Siḥr al-bayân*, ms. Köprülü 1284, fol. 3b: *fî ba'd mâ naṭaqa bihi 'l-Qur'ân al-karîm min al-kalâm al-mâjîz al-mu'jîz*. Fol. 4a, the reader is invited to consider 'uluwwa-hu (of the Koran) 'alâ sâ'ir al-kalâm. Nor does Ibn al-Mu'tazz (d. 908), *Kitâb al-âdâb*, ed. I. Kratchkovsky, *Monde Oriental*, XVIII (1924), 112—13, use *i'jâz* when he holds forth on the excellence,

had not yet been reserved for the style of the Revelation since al-Jâhiz observes¹⁷ that when the *ḥikmat al-ʿArab*, the Wisdom of the Arabs,¹⁸ is translated into another tongue the *muʿjiz* of its metre is destroyed.¹⁹

It was the contribution of the 10th century to insist on the formal or rhetorical uniqueness of the Koran to such an extent that it became part and parcel of the theological argument for the Book's supernatural character. ʿAlî b. ʿÎsâ ar-Rummânî (d. 994) devotes practically all his study of the *iʿjâz* to a demonstration of the Koran's uniqueness on the basis of its *balâga*, eloquence.²⁰ His analysis of the factors that result in the superb style of the Book is much superior in organization and integration of the illustrative material to the discussion which Ḥamd b. Muḥammad al-Ḥaṭṭâbî (d. 996 or 998) devotes to the same problem. It is true that Ḥaṭṭâbî, too, dedicates nine tenths of his tract on the *iʿjâz* to an investigation of the Koran's *balâga*, but his theoretical frame is somewhat loose and his principal object seems to be the taking up and refuting of specific criticisms launched against individual verses or turns of phrase in the Holy Book.²¹

faḍl, of the Koran over all other discourse basing his judgment at least partly on the Book's stylistic virtues. Al-Masʿûdî (d. ca. 956), *Murûj*, IV, 163—65, in an eloquent passage uses *iʿjâz* to denote the stylistic inimitability of the Koran.

17. *Ḥayawân*, I, 38.

18. As represented e.g. by Zuhair 16.47—59.

19. Ḥuṣrî (11th century), III, 154, quotes a letter of al-Ḥasan b. Wahb to Abû Tammâm in which he likens the latter's poetry to a *muʿjiza*. Ḥuṣrî himself still applies *iʿjâz* in praise of any eloquent discourse; cf. I, 135¹⁶ and 140¹⁰; so does ʿAbdarrahmân b. ʿAlî al-Yazdâdî (between 1050 and 1250 ?) speaking of the *rasâʾil* of Qâbûs b. Wašmgîr (d. 1012). Cf. *Kamâl al-balâga*, Cairo, 1341, pp. 27 and 32. *Ibid.*, p. 42, Ibn al-ʿAmîd's (d. 976) writings are described as *muʿjizât*.

Muzhir, I, 153, expounds the idea that the overwhelming richness of the Arabic vocabulary prevents adequate translation into any foreign tongue of an Arabic text. Cf. also the story, *Sirr*, p. 46, of the verse by Abû Tammâm translated unsatisfactorily for, and therefore not appreciated by the Greek emperor Nikephoros Phokas (963—969).

20. Rummânî greatly influenced al-Ḥafâjî who in 1062 wrote his famous *Sirr al-faṣâḥa* and through him Diyâʾ ad-Dîn Ibn al-Aʿtîr (d. 1239), the author of the even more renowned *al-Matal as-sâʾir fî adab al-kâtib waʾš-šâʾir*. Ḥuṣrî, I, 115—16, presents ar-Rummânî's arguments for the *iʿjâz*. For the ten elements which to Rummânî constitute *balâga* cf. Additional Remark (C) to the Table of Figures of Speech, on p. 118.

A saying by Ibn al-Muʿtazz, quoted by Ḥuṣrî, I, 115, would suggest that in his day the superiority of the Koran over each and every literary production had been generally accepted.

21. Ḥaṭṭâbî's treatise occupies foll. 1b—44a. Foll. 16a—30b are given over to the discussion of objections to individual Koranic passages, foll.

Bâqillânî's treatment of the problem appears thus considerably more elaborate and systematic than that accorded it by his predecessors. His position on the *i'jâz* has been succinctly stated by Tritton and his theological reasoning on the subject been set forth in some detail by Abdul Aleem.²² Full justice to the extraordinary tact with which Bâqillânî presented his subject will only be done when we realize that he differed from his contemporaries in that he felt the indubitable pre-eminence of the Koranic style to be no argument in favor of its theological uniqueness.²³ He repeatedly insists on the inability of man to reach the stylistic accomplishment of the Book but he does not propose to erect the *i'jâz* of the Koran on an aesthetic foundation. It would appear that his philosophical training made him uneasy about putting the *i'jâz* in any respect on an empirical basis.²⁴

31a—42a, to the refutation of the allegation that some parts of the Book had been matched successfully.

Abdul Aleem, who in 1934 was to publish Rummânî's essay, bases his account of Rummânî's and Ḥaṭṭâbî's ideas on Suyûṭî's quotations, *Itqân*, II, 121—22.

22. Tritton, *op. cit.*, p. 181; Abdul Aleem, *loc. cit.*, 225—26. See also T. Andrae, *Die Person Muhammads* . . . , Stockholm, 1918, pp. 94—100. Ahmed Deif, *Essai sur le lyrisme et la critique littéraire chez les Arabes*, Paris, 1917, pp. 155—60, makes a rather feeble attempt at analysing Bâqillânî's position with regard to the Koran as a literary achievement. The interest of Deif's remarks is due mostly to the fact that he seems to have been the first modern Oriental student to embark on a systematic study of Arabic criticism in the 9th and 10th centuries.

23. Cf. below, pp. 54—5, and also *Tamhîd*, pp. 125—26.

Perhaps no orthodox theologian of the 10th century would have agreed with Bâqillânî on this point. Râwandî (d. 910) who compiled a list of contradictions in the Book—quoted and refuted by Râzî, pp. 165—66—was a dissenter and reputedly an atheist; and Abû Hâsim (d. 933), who held that non-Arabs could produce a book like the Koran (cf. Tritton, *op. cit.*, p. 155), a Mu'tazilite.

Another line of 10th century thought is represented by Muṭahhar b. Ṭâhir al-Maqdisî (fl. 966), *Kitâb bad' al-ḥalq*, ed. & trans. C. Huart, Paris, 1898—1915, IV, 175—76 (trans., IV, 164—65). In his view, a phenomenon may be a miracle at one period but not at another. The miraculous character of any event or for that matter of the Koran is relative to the circumstances in which it occurred. In the *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, L (1904), 212, note 1, Huart refers to the 44th Tract of the Corpus of the Iḥwân as-ṣafâ as maintaining a kindred viewpoint.

24 An empirical method of tracing rhetorical excellence in sacred writings had been acceptable in Christianity as witness St. Augustine. In his approach he was actuated not by a desire to prove the inimitability of the style of either the Old or the New Testament, but by the wish to encourage Christian preachers to avail themselves of the technique of rhetoric in order to increase the efficacy of their sermons. So he pointed out that the

Abû Hilâl al-‘Askarî (d. 1005), whose literary views greatly influenced the theologian, did not equal Bâqillânî's subtlety when he declared at the beginning of his epoch-making *Kitâb aṣ-ṣinâ‘atâin*²⁵ that he presents his book “as an exposition of the particular science by means of which the *i‘jâz al-Qur’ân* is recognized.”²⁶ Nor did later analysts of the *i‘jâz* maintain his caution. Thus, Ibn Qayyim al-Jauziyya, noted Ḥanbalite theologian (d. 1350), simply says that he who knows Arabic and is familiar with lexicography, grammar, rhetoric, Arabic poetry and prose will *eo ipso* recognize the supremacy of the Koran.²⁷

Despite his theological reservation with respect to the conclusiveness of the argument Bâqillânî sets out vigorously to prove the inferiority of all Arabic literature to the Koran. To this end he inserted in his book

various rhetorical *genera dictionis* could easily be traced in the Scriptures. The fourth book of his *De Doctrina Christiana* (ed. H. J. Vogels, Bonn, 1930; also ed. with trans. and cmt. by Sr. Th. Sullivan, Washington, D.C., 1930) is devoted to this task. According to Sullivan, Introduction, p. 4, it was probably written in A.D. 426—7.

Augustine first analyses (VII, 11) the rhetorical composition and figures of Romans 3:3—5, 2 Cor 11:16—30 (VII, 12,13), Amos 6:1—6 (VII, 16—20). He then adduces Gal 4:21—26 and Gal 3:15—22 as specimens of the subdued style (*genus submissum*; XX, 39); 1 Tim 5:1—2, Rom 12:1 and 12:6—16, Rom 13:6—8 and 13:12—14, of the moderate (*genus temperatum*; XX, 40), and 2 Cor 6:2—11, Rom 8:28—39, Gal 4:10—20, of the grand (*genus grande*; XX 42, 43).

Augustine's position is much less precarious than that of the apologists of the Koranic style as he feels no obligation to uphold the blamelessness of the Scriptures' style. Thus (VIII, 22) he admits the obscurity of some scriptural passages—Bâqillânî emphatically denies any obscurity in the Koran—as well as certain deficiencies in the rhythmical arrangement of their diction (XX, 41). Here Augustine only adds that no major stylistic requirement is missing and that slight changes in word order would establish such *clausulae* as would satisfy the rhetorician.

By tracing rhetorical style in the Scriptures Augustine took up the defense of the Biblical writings against the contempt which their simplicity provoked on the part of the educated, a feeling which at one time he had experienced himself; cf. *Confessions*, III, 5. Earlier Fathers, such as Cyprian (d. 258), *Ad Donatum* (trans. F. A. Wright, *Fathers of the Church*, London, 1928, p. 100), and Lactantius (d. ca. 340), *Institutiones Divinae*, VI, 21, 4—6, had already fought that same attitude.

On the pagan side it was Libanios who, *or.* XIII, 1, addressing the emperor Julian, emphasized the ties between eloquence and piety. Cf. A. D. Nock, *Sallustius, Concerning the Gods and the Universe*, Cambridge, 1926, Introduction, p. L and note 53.

25. P. 2.

26. *JAOS*, LXI (1941), 51—52.

27. *Fawâ'id*, p. 7. On pp. 246—255 Ibn Qayyim discusses extensively the grounds on which various authorities rest their doctrine of the *i‘jâz*.

three lengthy and by contemporary standards highly unconventional sections. The first (pp. 69—98) demonstrates the occurrence in the Koran of the figures of speech used by the poets, the second (pp. 129—148) and the third (pp. 172—192) point out the inadequacies and weaknesses of even the best of Arabic poems, taking as examples the *mu'allaga* of Imru'ulqais²⁸ and a celebrated poem of al-Buhturî²⁹ respectively. In this manner he gives himself an opportunity to destroy the nimbus around both classical and "modern" poetry. The principles applied in his criticism (together with those generally accepted by his contemporaries) have been discussed by this writer in some detail, *JAOS*, LXI (1941), 51—57.

Bâqillânî's position in the development of rhetoric may be summed up as follows:

(1) His outlook is that of an educated layman rather than that of a specialist. He does not seem to have felt the urge to build up or to adopt a consistent system of terms and definitions.

(2) It cannot be said with certainty whence al-Bâqillânî derived his terms and definitions.

(3) His list of figures of speech³⁰ shows most resemblance to that offered by al-'Askarî: out of the 34 figures which al-Bâqillânî mentions 26 occur in the *Kitâb aş-şinâ'atain*. It must be noted, however, that the arrangement of the figures in Bâqillânî is greatly inferior to that chosen by al-'Askarî and that, moreover, only one of the six figures first observed by al-'Askarî appears in his book.³¹

(4) On the other hand, the influence of Qudâma b. Ja'far (d. 922) is still fairly strong in Bâqillânî. When Qudâma and 'Askarî disagree Bâqillânî does not necessarily take sides.³² There is, however, only one term, *takâfu*,³³ which Bâqillânî and Qudâma share without its appearing in the *Kitâb aş-şinâ'atain* as well.

(5) In relation to contemporary non-specialist terminology as represented by al-Ĥwârizmî's *Mafâtîḥ al-'ulûm* Bâqillânî's vocabulary is better developed: he employs 34 terms where Ĥwârizmî offers only 19.

(6) The progress over Ibn al-Mu'tazz' pioneering *Kitâb al-badî'* is considerable.

28. Ed. Ahlwardt, no. 48.

29. Constantinople, 1300, II, 217.12 ff.

30. See the Table of Figures of Speech at the end of the book.

31. *ta'atṭuf* (iteration); no. 23 in Bâqillânî, no. 32 in 'Askarî.

32. This observation will become clear from the notes to the individual terms.

33. No. 22 in Bâqillânî, no. 7 in Qudâma. For the meaning cf. p. 37, note 287.

(7) Bâqillânî's defective training is visible e.g. in his inclusion of *musâwât*, adequacy of style, in the figures of speech.³⁴

(8) The incipient development of the high points of later theory, viz. of the relation between *haqîqa*, the proper, and *majâz*, the tropical use of words, and its consequences for the theory of *tašbîh*, simile, and *isti'âra*, metaphor, are disregarded by Bâqillânî. His concept of style does not measure up in any way to that of his successor in the study of *i'jâz*, 'Abdalqâhir al-Jurjânî (d. 1078).³⁵

The examples quoted by Bâqillânî to illustrate his figures clearly indicate that he was not dependent on any one author. Many of his references he has in common with Ibn al-Mu'tazz or al-'Askarî, but it is obvious that he did his own selecting using sources not drawn upon by either the *Kitâb al-badî'* or the *Kitâb aṣ-ṣinâ'atâin*.³⁶

The translation of those passages in al-Bâqillânî's *I'jâz al-Qur'ân* that are of relevance for the understanding of Arabic literary theory and criticism is, in the eyes of this writer, justified by their unique character in Arabic literature. There are innumerable paragraphs and even whole books discussing the merits and demerits of individual verses or fragments but never once did an Arab author undertake to dissect the better part of two lengthy poems from the aesthetic viewpoint as Bâqillânî does in his sections on Imru'ulqais³⁷ and Buhturî. The chapter on the figures of speech, on the other hand, is the first of its kind by a non-specialist that has come down to us, and it is a real innovation in its peculiar objective and arrangement.³⁸ The fact that no text of this character has, to the writer's knowledge, ever been translated into a Western language served as a further incentive. It is hoped that students of literature in general will thus be enabled to obtain a more precise insight into the ways and aims of Arab poets and writers.

The translation, which does not aim at concealing the harshness of Bâqillânî's style, is as carefully annotated and explained as it was possible for the writer to achieve. The *variae lectiones* of the verses and sayings quoted have not been printed, partly to save costs and partly

34. See the discussion, p. 27, note 221. The same error occurs in *Qânân*, pp. 440—41, where it is nonetheless correctly described as the mean between *ijâz* and *ishâb*.

35. Cf. specifically *Dalâ'il*, pp. 32 ff., 294 ff., 397 ff.

36. The references accompanying the individual verses and sayings will bear out this statement and provide the necessary detail.

37. The passage *Ag*, VIII, 59—62 (= *Ag*³, IX, 69—76), where fifteen verses of his *mu'allaga* are quoted and explained offers nothing beyond rather meagre philological comment.

38. In addition to the passages mentioned above, pp. 126—28 and 170—72 have been translated as an introduction to Parts II and III respectively.

because it was felt that their reproduction would contribute little to the general understanding of the subject. The edition of the *I'jâz al-Qur'ân* used for the translation is the fairly adequate print, Cairo, 1349. The appended Table of Figures of Speech as used by Ibn al-Mu'tazz, Qudâma, Hwârizmî and al-'Askarî is meant to help the reader toward quicker orientation in the maze of terminology. Qudâma's terms as they occur in the *Naqd an-naṭr* are added for convenience, but it should be borne in mind that this book may not go back to Qudâma himself, but have been actually composed in the 13th century on the basis of material and views provided by Qudâma.³⁹ As to the comments on the terms it should be remembered that there was no intention of presenting their complete history. The terms were only to be explained and followed in their development up to Bâqillânî's time. References to their later fate have, therefore, as a rule been given more sparingly. The Indices (Personal Names, Place Names, Rhetorical Terms, Koranic Quotations) will, it is hoped, facilitate the use of the translation.

39. Cf. G. Levi Della Vida, *RSO*, XIII (1931), 331-33, and *GAL*, Suppl., I, 407.

PART I

RHETORICAL FIGURES IN POETRY AND QUR'ÂN

If anybody asks: "Can the *i'jâz* of the Qur'ân be recognized by the rhetorical figures (*badî'*) which it contains?" the answer is:¹ The experts

1. The pattern *in sa'ala (in qâla) ... qîla lahu*, or *in sa'ala ... fa-ya'lam* and the like, where the characteristic element is the reply to or the refutation of the questioner, or the adversary, in the form of a hypothetical period, constitutes one more instance of a stylistic pattern taken over by Arab writers from classical tradition. Before listing examples attention should be called to the fact that this pattern is by no means indispensable. In the first place there is no necessity to affect a dialogue. In the second place, if a dialogue is affected the more obvious form to be selected—aside from that of the true dialogue—would be one in which statement and counterstatement are put side by side independently, i. e., not joined in a single conditional period. The much greater number of non-conditional examples fully bears out this consideration. For the present purpose it will suffice to trace the pattern back to early Christian controversy. Cf. Origen (d. 254), *Contra Celsum*, VI, 68 (quoted by E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, Berlin, 1913, p. 89): διόπερ ἐὰν ἔρηται ἡμᾶς Κέλσος ... ἀποκρινόμεθα; *ibid.*, VII, 15: ἐπεὶ δ'ἀδυνατά τινα ... φασιν ... λεκτέον ὅτι ...; *ibid.*, VIII, 54: εἴτ', ἐπεὶ φησιν ὁ Κέλσος..., λεκτέον πρὸς αὐτὸν, ὅτι.... There is no call for the following up of the pattern through late antiquity. But it is important to note that the influential John of Damascus (d. ca. 749) uses it fairly frequently. Some of the instances are: *De imaginibus*, or. II, 18 (Migne, PG, 94. 1304—5): εἰ δὲ λέγεις ... γινῶθι; *contra Jacobitas*, II, 50 (1457): εἰ δὲ φατε ... μάθετε καλῶς διδασκόμενοι ...; *Disceptatio Christiani et Saraceni*, where chapters 1—5 begin either *si interrogaris a Saraceno ... dic ipsi ...*, or *si dicat tibi Saracenus... dic ipsi* (PG, 94.1586—90); *Adv. Nestorianos*, ch. 3 (PG, 95.189): εἰ δὲ φατε ... φαμέν, ὅτι.... John's influence on Theodorus Abû Qurra (d. ca. 820) is well-known. Little wonder that Theodorus uses this time-honored pattern of polemical discussion in his Arabic writings. The following references are taken from G. Graf's translation of the Arabic text (*Die arabischen Schriften des Theodor Abû Qurra*, Paderborn, 1910) where the pages of the original are added; Mîmar I, 7 (p. 94 of the translation), III, 20 (p. 153), III, 21 (p. 154), IX, 4 (p. 225), IX, 5 (p. 225), X, 22 (p. 257), XI, 24 (p. 332). The extensive use made of the pattern by Arab theologians and philosophers is easily ascertained. Al-Aš'arî's (d. 935) *Ibâna 'an usûl ad-diyâna* may serve as an example from the time between Theodorus and al-Bâqillânî. Cf. pp. 49, 57, 58, 60, a. o., of the translation by W. C. Klein, New Haven, 1940. The occurrence of this pattern in Talmudic literature may suggest its Oriental origin without, however, changing the picture of the comparatively late development just outlined. A typology of the patterns used in Arabic controversy has been suggested by the present writer in *Scientia*, XLIV (1950), 23, note 3, of the English, p. 13, note 2, of the French edition.

(*ahl aṣ-ṣan'a*) and those who have composed books on the subject of the character of the *badī'* (rhetorical element)² have recorded opinions which we are going to recount. Then, we will clarify their problems in order that the discussion (*kalām*) may deal with a clearly established subject and a well defined proposition.

The following passages are quoted from the Qur'ân as representing figurative speech (*badī'*): "Lower to them the wing of humility (i. e., bear thyself humbly towards them) out of compassion."³—"And lo, it is in the Mother of the Book, in Our presence, exalted, wise."⁴—"... and my head is lit up with white."⁵—"A sign for them also is the night. We strip

2. Throughout the 9th century *badī'* means just "new, worthy of notice, original." Cf. *Ḥayawân*, III, 17, IMudabbir (d. 892), p. 37. Ibn al-Mu'tazz in his *Kitâb al-badī'* then used the term in the sense of the "new" style, i. e. the style that employs rhetorical figures. From his time the word was used in both senses, the meaning "original" occurring far more frequently; cf. Âmidî, pp. 55²², 94²⁴, 171⁶, *Ṣin* 15³, 34²¹, 42¹⁵, F. H. Dieterici, *Mutanabbî und Seifuddaula*, Leipzig, 1847, pp. 17 and 54 (from at-Ta'âlîbî's *Yatîma*), *Mutanabbî*, ed. F. H. Dieterici, Berlin, 1861, 105.36 (p. 283): *al-badī' al-fard min abyâti-hâ*, and many passages in *I'jâz*. At the same time Âmidî, p. 6, says that *badī'* consists of *isti'âra*, *tajnis*, and *ṭibâq*, and uses *badâ'i'* as synonym of *maḥâsin*, p. 171²⁷. In due course *badī'* acquired the general meaning of "trope" and the third part of Literary Theory as finally evolved by as-Sakkâkî, al-Qazwînî, and at-Taftazânî, was called '*ilm al-badī'*', "Tropenlehre."

3. Qur'ân 17.25. The Koranic verses are numbered in accordance with the edition of the Koran by G. Flügel, Leipzig, 1893. The translations are, for the most part, those of R. Bell, *The Qur'ân*, Edinburgh, 1937—1939, occasionally those of Rodwell. Slight changes by the present writer have not been marked.

Qur'ân 17.25 is frequently alluded to. Cf. e. g. al-'Askarî's phrase in a letter of his which he quotes *DM*, I, 220¹⁶: *wa-qad ḥaḥadtu laka janâḥ ad-dull* ..., and at-Taftazânî, *Muḥtaṣar*, I, 29², who describes the prince to whom he dedicates his work as *ḥâfiḍ janâḥ ar-raḥma li-ahl al-ḥaqq wa'l-yaqîn*. *Iršâd*, I, 279¹⁹, praises the jurist, Ibrâhîm b. 'Uṭmân al-Qairawânî (d. 957), for his unpretentiousness and his *ḥafḍ janâḥ*. Cf. also *Itqân*, II, 44. Gazzâlî, *Iḥyâ' 'ulûm ad-dîn*, Bûlâq, 1289/1872, II, 184³, quotes a *ḥadîth* in which the Prophet enjoins the *ḥafḍ al-janâḥ*.

Fawâ'id, pp. 51—52, reports that most experts consider the phrase: "Lower to them the wing of humility," an *isti'âra taḥyîliyya*. He then tells this story. When Abû Tammâm had composed the line:

'Do not give me to drink the water of blame (*mâ' al-malâm*), for I am pouring forth tears and have tried to sweeten the water of my weeping;' he was met by a man with a wooden bowl who asked him to give him a little of the "water of blame." Abû Tammâm replied: "I shall not give it to you before you give me a feather of the 'wing of humility.'"

4. Qur'ân 43.3. The Mother of the Book denotes the heavenly prototype of the Koran.

5. Qur'ân 19.3.

the day from it, and lo, they are in darkness.”⁶—“... or there come upon them the punishment of a barren day.”⁷—“... light upon light...”⁸

Sometimes figurative speech (*badî'*) occurs in comprehensive sayings of a legislative character such as His word: “In retaliation is life for you...”⁹ and (sometimes) in eloquent passages such as His word: “So when they despaired of him, they withdrew privately...”¹⁰, further in passages on the nature of the divine, such as His words: “All things are His...”¹¹—“Whatever pleasant thing ye have is from Allâh.”¹²—And “With whom shall be the power supreme on that day? With Allâh, the One, the Almighty.”¹³

And (the experts) record figurative speech (*badî'*) in the sayings of the Prophet (as opposed to the word of God collected in the Qur'ân) such as: “Best of men is a man who holds fast the rein of his horse on the path of Allâh. Whenever he hears a terrible cry (of somebody in danger) he flies toward it.”¹⁴ And: “Oh our Lord, accept my repentance and wash off my sin.”¹⁵ And: “The sickness of the nations who preceded you, viz. envy (p. 70) and hatred, has overpowered you. These are the ‘shavers’, the shavers of religion, not the shavers of hair.”¹⁶ And: “People are like one hundred camels among which you do not find one riding-beast.”¹⁷ And: “Is there anything to prostrate people on their noses in the fire of Jahannam except their slanderous talk (lit.: the stalks of reaped crops of their tongue)?”¹⁸ And: “Verily, some of what the (rain, or season, called)

6. Qur'ân 36.37.

7. Qur'ân 22.54. *Badî'*, p. 3, quotes all the foregoing Koran verses in practically the same connection. But Ibn al-Mu'tazz selects Qur'ân 3.5 to exemplify the use of *umm al-kitâb* (Mother of the Book) where al-Bâqillânî uses 43.3.

8. Qur'ân 24.35.

9. Qur'ân 2.175.

10. Qur'ân 12.80.

11. Qur'ân 27.93.

12. Qur'ân 16.55.

13. Qur'ân 40.16.

14. *Badî'*, p. 3.—References by other authors to passages quoted by both *I'jâz* and *Badî'* will, as a rule, only be given if they have not been included in Kratchkovsky's notes.

15. *Badî'*, p. 4; 'Umda, I, 245 (quoted as *isti'âra*), Nuwairî, VII, 104; I. Goldziher, *Vorlesungen über den Islam*, 2nd ed., Heidelberg, 1925, p. 210 (quoted from *Amâlî*, II, 267).

16. *Bayân*, II, 19; *Badî'*, p. 4.

17. Qazwîni, Taftazânî, *Îdâh*, IV, 266; *Asrâr*, pp. 85 and 199; *Bayân*, II, 17 and 227. Sakkâkî, p. 206, quotes the saying with disapproval as bordering on the enigmatical (*ta'miya* and *lugz*).

18. *Bayân*, I, 169 and 213; *IA*, p. 151^{12, 13}; *Muhâdarât*, I, 147⁷; M. Horten, *Die religiöse Gedankenwelt des Volkes im heutigen Islam*, Halle a. S., I, 209.

voidable that perfection of beauty be denied to his words and that the highest stage (of perfection) be withheld from his diction. How (could it be otherwise)! since (such perfection) has been denied to (men) more illustrious than he and more powerful in their art (*ṣan'a*) and of a superior (or: more ancient) class (*akbar fî 't-ṭabaqa*), such as Imru'ulqais, Zuhair, an-Nâbiga, and (others) down to his own day?³⁹¹

We are going to explain in a separate chapter the peculiarities (*tamayîz*) of their diction, the inferiority of their discourse, and the lesser rank of their composition as compared with the rhetorical beauty (*badî'*) in the composition of the Qur'ân. (In this chapter) with the will of Allâh and His help (will be) presented the necessary characteristics of the masters of poetical technique, and, (on the other hand) the verification of the *i'jâz*.³⁹²

Now our discourse leads us back to what we have discussed before, to wit, that there is no approach to the understanding of the *i'jâz al-Qur'ân* by way of the rhetorical figures (*badî'*) such as they find and describe in poetry.³⁹³ This (holds good) because this branch of knowledge (i. e., the science of the *badî'*) in no way "disrupts the habit" (*yahruqu 'l-âda*)³⁹⁴ nor transcends (the sphere of) common experience (*'urf*). On the contrary, it can be improved upon by study, training and application, just as the composition of poetry, the making of prose addresses, the writing of epistles, and the skill in eloquence. And toward this (skill) there exists a trodden path, a (traditional) approach, a ladder which can be ascended step by step, and a pattern which the student may follow. And many people acquire the habit of composing all their speech in poetry, or of making all their addresses in *saĵ'* or in some other rhythmically bound form (*ṣan'atan muttasalatan*),³⁹⁵ so that no letter in their speech is open to criticism, and they even improvise at times along the style to which they have become accustomed. And you see how the literary experts (*udabâ'*) of our own time collect the "pearls of oratory" (*maḥâsin*) in a special volume (*juz'*). Thus they compose books on the

391. Al-Bâqillânî's judgment of Abû Tammâm and al-Buḥturî agrees essentially with that arrived at by al-Âmidî. Cf., e.g., the comparative characterization of the two poets, Âmidî, p. 2.

392. Al-Bâqillânî probably refers to his analyses of Imru'ulqais and al-Buḥturî as translated in Parts II and III respectively.

393. Cf. the Introduction to this translation, pp. xviii—xix.

394. Muslim theology does not recognize "laws of nature" and only admits the existence of habits (*'âdât*) of nature—such as the lack of food habitually but not necessarily entailing the feeling of hunger. Thus a miracle in our sense is nothing but a breaking of such a habit on the part of Allâh. Cf., e.g., Goldziher, *Vorlesungen*, pp. 128—33.

395. The idea is *oratio vineta*.

various kinds of what is (rhetorically) excellent. Then they consult these (works) when they desire to produce a *qaṣīda* or a *risāla* or a *ḥutba*, and pad their composition with (what they find in these books). And whoever is trained sufficiently and advanced in his command (*ḥifẓ*) of (this kind of literature) no longer needs to consult them, or to trouble himself with such compositions. And his knowledge (of this art) enlarges the orbit of his speech and adorns it with (various) types of rhetorical figures (*badīʿ*) to the extent that he may desire. And this is a road not impossible (to travel) and a door not inaccessible. It is open to everybody and (everybody) arrives at some halting-place according to his knowledge and in proportion to the help extended to him by his natural gifts.

But as for the ambition (of rivalling) the composition of the Qurʾān, there is no pattern to be followed nor an Imām to be imitated; nor can anything like it be achieved by chance, as an extraordinary verse, a word that goes around amongst the people, (P. 98) a singular and unusual idea, or a rare (*qalīl*) and surprising (saying) may perchance occur to a poet, just as his word may (at times) reach the untamed beasts and penetrate to the wild animals. For the unusual occurs to the poet in some parts (*lamʿ*) of his poetry only, to the secretary (*kātib*) in fractions of his epistles (*rasāʾil*), and to the preacher (*ḥaṭīb*) in a small section of his sermon (*ḥutba*). And even if all of his poetry were extraordinary and a proverbial saying (*maṭal*) traversing the world, full of original ideas and elegant words, if all his discourse (*kalām*) were aglow with radiance and splendor, filled with brilliance and bright beauty, if there should not be met in it mediocrity (*al-mutawassīṭ bain al-kalāmain*), vacillation (*al-mutaraddid bain at-tarafain*), chilliness, cumbersomeness, coarseness or whatever else may be objectionable: it would not disclose the uniqueness (*iʿjāz*) in the (Divine) Speech (*kalām*),³⁹⁶ nor reveal the amazing disparity (*tafāwut*) between (human and divine) composition (*niẓām*).

The above is only an abstract requiring further particulars, a vague summary (*mubham*) which in part calls for comment. We shall record all that, Allāh willing and helping. It may, however, be said of the rhetorical figures (*badīʿ*) which we have recounted and to (the examples of) which we have added (from our own) that they represent one of the elements of literary excellence and one of the types (*jins*) of eloquence. (It may further be said) that the Qurʾān cannot be separated from any of the rhetorical sciences (*fann min funūn balāġāti-him*) nor from any type of eloquence (*wajh min wujūh faṣāḥāti-him*). If this line of argument is adopted and the subject matter formulated in this way, then it is well and good. We refrain, however, from stating the above without restriction.

396. I. e., it would still be clear for theological reasons.

(*lam nuṭliq al-qaul itlâqan*), because we do not connect the *i'jâz* with these special aspects (of rhetorical excellence) nor base it on them, nor tie it to them, although it is correct (to say) that these (rhetorical) forms have put their imprint on the entire (Qur'ân), contributing their share to its beauty and elegance, wherever they are employed, (always) free from distasteful affectation and hideous artificiality.

PART II

CRITICISM OF IMRU'ULQAIS' MU'ALLAQA

I have given you a summary review of the discourses of the first Islamic generation and their diatribes (*muhâwarât*) and addresses (*huṭab*).¹ For what I have omitted I refer you to the annals and the books, composed on this subject. So think this over as well as everything else that has been recorded regarding our forebears and the judicious masters of rhetoric, eloquence, and correct diction. Study also the prose expressions and the conversational phrases in use amongst them, and the parables handed down from them. Contemplate all this with the quiet of a bird, with lowered wings, relaxation of the mind and concentration of the intellect. Then the difference in value (*faḍl*) between the speech of men and the speech of the Lord of the Worlds will strike you, and you will recognize that the composition (*naẓm*) of the Qur'ân differs in essence from the composition of the speech of humankind; and you will see the borderline that obtains between the speech of the various eloquent men, orators (*ḥaṭīb*), and poets, and again between all of them and the composition of the Qur'ân.

In case you should imagine or suspect that a comparison between the composition of poetry and of the Qur'ân is necessary on the ground that poetry is eo ipso more eloquent, excellent and subtle than any address, epistle or diatribe in prose — it was for this reason that it was said of the Prophet: he is a poet or a magician —, and in case the Devil has deluded you into the belief that poetry is more eloquent, more startling (*a'jab*), (P. 127) finer and better, in fact the most beautiful and the most original kind of speech — this subject (*faṣl*) has been extensively studied by the philosophers (*mutakallimûn*) and discussed by the critics.

Did you hear (the scholar) who is — as far as I am aware — the foremost expert in literature (*adab*), and the most skilful in this craft (*ṣinâ'a*), apart from being prominent in (the art of) discourse (*kalâm*), say:² Prose admits of some elements of eloquence and rhetoric which

1. On the preceding pages of the *I'jâz* which are not here translated.

2. The reference probably is to *Ṣin*, pp. 102—104. But al-'Askarî makes the reader understand that, all in all, he considers poetry richer than prose in spite of the fact that there are some subjects from which it is barred (such as the *ḥuṭba*; Ibn Ḥaldûn, *Prolegomena*, III, 323 [transl., III, 361—62], mentions the *du'â* in this connection). Ta'âlibî, *Kitâb naṭr an-naẓm*, Cairo, 1317, pp. 2—4, ranks prose above poetry because of its greater

poetry does not admit. For poetry narrows the possibility of rendering ideas (*niṭāq al-kalām*), prevents the word from reaching its limit, and hinders its full display according to its traditional usage (*sunan*). There was, however, another scholar in his company who likewise excelled in the craftsmanship of speech and who conferred with him on the subject. He mentioned that there is no (a priori) reason why poetry should not be more eloquent (*ablaḡ*) (than prose) if it meets the requirements of rhetoric (*faṣāḥa*), or more original (*abda'*) if it encompasses the various means of eloquence.³ In my opinion, the latter view is borne out by the fact that the bulk of excellent speech in Arabic is composed in poetry, and that we do not find in Arabic prose what we find in Arabic verse. If recently epistles in Arabic have reached a degree of excellence such as cannot be found in any earlier period and cannot have been taken over from early *dīwāns* and historical accounts (*aḥbār*),⁴ nevertheless it is poetry which comprises the entire substance and all the paraphernalia of human discourse, and this notwithstanding the fact that poetry is limited in its linguistic freedom. Therefore, if poetry is well arranged within its domain and if all its implements are complete, no (other) human discourse approaches it and no (prose) address can compete with it.⁵

It is related of al-Mutanabbī that he was looking at the Book (*maṣḥaf*) while one of his friends entered who did not like to see him look at it because of al-Mutanabbī's heretical views (concerning the Qur'ān). So (al-Mutanabbī) said to him: With all his rhetorical talents (*faṣāḥa*) this Meccan was unable to express himself in verse.⁶ If this story about him

usefulness — the *kātib* takes precedence over the *ṣā'ir*. Qalqaṣandī (d. 1418), too, *Subh*, I, 58—61, prefers prose to poetry; cf. also M. Nallino, *RSO*, XIV (1933—34), 178. The most interesting discussion of the subject is in *Imtā'*, II, 130—42.

3. This is the generally accepted opinion amongst Arab critics and theorists. It was first elaborated by al-Mubarrad, in his *Epistle on Poetry and Prose*, ed. by the present writer, *Orientalia*, n. s., X (1941), 372—82. The principal consideration in favor of poetry's precedence over prose is the argument that, all other elements being equal, poetry has the additional merit of metre and rhyme. In other words, the overcoming of the obstacles of form by the poet entitles his work to a higher rank than mere prose representation of his ideas would secure for him.

4. Al-Bāqillānī here refers to the *rasā'il* of al-Ḥwārizmī (d. 993 or 1002) and al-Badī' al-Hamaḍānī (d. 1008).

5. There is a certain inconsistency in al-Bāqillānī's views on the respective rank of poetry and prose. At first he is inclined to accord precedence to prose. Then he reverses himself in favor of poetry, always maintaining, however, the incomparable preeminence of the Qur'ān.

6. F. Gabrieli, *RSO*, XI (1926), 33—34, and R. Blachère, *Abou ṭ-Tayyib al-Mutanabbī*, Paris, 1935, p. 67, translate the one fragment from al-Mutanabbī's rival Qur'ān that has been preserved.

evinced his heretical attitude is true it shows that he considered rhetorical power in poetry as more eloquent (than in prose).

Now, no matter whether poetical speech does possess rhetorical power or not, we have made it plain that the composition of the Qur'ân excels every kind of composition in rhetorical power, and that it surpasses every kind of speech in eloquence (*balâğa*).⁷ (By means of proofs) which made this matter as clear as the sun and as lucid as morning, you have been enabled to see its obviousness. Please consider now what we shall submit to you⁸ and picture in your own mind what we will attempt to picture to you to the end that you may clearly realize that rank of the Qur'ân. Contemplation of what we have put in systematic order will reveal the truth to you.

If we wish to prove our assertion we have to turn to a poem (*qaṣīda*), the high rank, correctness (*ṣiḥḥa*) of composition (P. 128), excellence of eloquence and ideas (*jûda balâğa wa-ma'ânî*) of which are as generally accepted as the originality of its author, his preeminence in craftsmanship and his poetical tact. Then we will make you see where it is faulty, inconsistent (*tafâwut*) in its composition, inharmonious in its component parts (*iḥtilâf fuṣûli-hâ*), and we will point out to you superfluous additions (*fudûl*), its embarrassing solecisms and its constraint (*takalluf*), its combination of elevated (*rafî'*) and base (*waḍî'*) language, of vulgar and royal diction, as well as other similar weaknesses, followed by a systematic description in detail.

(P. 129) So now let us return to our discussion of poems whose excellence has been agreed upon as has the preeminence of their authors

7. *Muzhir*, II, 236, seeks to invalidate the claim of those who, from the prose style of the Qur'ân, argue the superiority of prose over poetry by pointing out that the Qur'ân was revealed in prose so its unique perfection would appear even more wondrous because unaided by the natural beauty of the poetical form.

Christian critics of the Koran differ in their views on the Book's style. The Spaniard, Alvaro (wrote in 854), is greatly impressed with the beauty of Koranic diction; cf. ch. 29 of his *Indiculus Luminosus*, in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, CXXI, 546C (the passage is referred to by Th. W. Arnold, *The Preaching of Islam*, 2nd ed., London, 1913, p. 138, note 4). Al-Kindî, *Apology* (written after 912, according to L. Massignon, *EL*, II, 1021), trans. Sir Wm. Muir, London, 1882, pp. 30—31, attacks the style of the Koran as "broken in its rhythm, confused in its composition, and in its flights of fancy unmeaning." Ricoldus de Santa Cruce (ca. 1300) feels that the rhythmical structure of the Koran militates against its divinity (Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, CLIV, 1057—58).

On the development of the *i'jâz* concept and the Christian reaction to the Koran cf. the present writer's *Medieval Islam. A Study in Cultural Orientation*, 2nd printing, Chicago, 1947, pp. 96—100.

8. The text erroneously repeats *mâ nu'riḍu-hu*.

in their craft. Thus the contrast between the different kinds of discourse (*ḥitāb*) and the distance between the (various) specimens of eloquence will become clear to you, and you may draw your own conclusions as to where (real) perfection (*barā'a*) rests.

You do not doubt the excellence of Imru'ulqais' poetry, nor are you sceptical regarding its perfection, and you do not hesitate (to affirm) the purity of his language (*faṣāḥa*). You also know that he has introduced new elements into the poetical style which have been followed (ever since), beginning with the (deserted) tent-places (*diyār*) and halting at them, to the innovations introduced by him in connection therewith. (You are likewise familiar with) the comparisons (*tašbīḥ*) which he brought into use, the elegance (*tamlīḥ*) to be found in his poems, the great versatility (or: variety; *taṣarruf*) you encounter in his speech, and the different categories into which (the virtues of) his diction may be divided, such as artistic finesse (*ṣinā'a*), naturalness, easiness (of elocution), elevation, strength and softness, and (other) laudable qualities and points deserving adoption and appreciation.⁹

You often see men of literary understanding at first weighing (the work of) one or the other poet against (Imru'ulqais') poetry and holding the poetry of newly arising poets against that of Imru'ulqais (for the purpose of comparing and judging them by his standards), so much so that they at times draw the balance between the poetical work of contemporary poets (P. 130) and Imru'ulqais in regard to pleasantness of detail and originality of phrase. And many times the (critics) give them preference over Imru'ulqais, or consider them equal to him, or concede to them, or to him (as the case may be) a small margin of superiority. After the critics had chosen his *qaṣīda* among the Seven (*fī 's-sab'iyyāt*)¹⁰ they added to it similar *qaṣīdas* and joined to it others of equal structure. You hear (the critics) challenging a poet: (compose a) *lāmiyya*¹¹ like (the *mu'allāqa* of Imru'ulqais)! Then you see the souls of the poets wrestling to match (*mu'ārada*)¹² or equal it in its style. Frequently they stumble in many respects as compared to him, or again excel him in some points,

9. This paragraph is quoted by C.A. Nallino, *Raccolta di scritti*, Rome, 1938—48, VI, 25.

10. I. e., the *mu'allāqāt*. On the genesis of this selection of seven or, in some redactions, more outstanding ancient poems, see, e. g., Th. Nöldeke, *SBWA*, phil.-hist. Kl., CXL (1899), Abh. 7, Introduction. With regard to the superiority over his contemporaries accorded Imru'ulqais by the critics it should be mentioned that al-Āmidī wrote a *Kitāb tafdīl šī'r Imrī'ilqais 'alā 'l-jāhiliyyīn*, *Iršād*, III, 58⁵.

11. A poem rhyming in -l.

12. *Dalā'il*, pp. 199—200, develops this expression into a technical term. On the *mu'ārada* cf. the writer, *JNES*, III (1944), 242.

truly astounding. But when it comes to counting the beauties (*maḥāsīn*)¹³ of Imru'ulqais' poetry you will find them limited in number and a thing within your ken. You meet with rhetorical figures (or: original traits; *badī'*) just like his or even more beautiful in poetry other than his, and you perceive the same excellence in the diction of other poets. Look at the modern poets (*al-muḥdatūn*): how they go deep into (the process of) gathering beautiful traits (*maḥāsīn*). Some of them unite graveness of speech (*raṣāna*) with easiness of elocution (*salāsa*), strength with sweetness, and pertinence (*iṣāba*) of the idea with brilliant elegance of expression, so that there are some amongst them who though they may fall short of (Imru'ulqais) in some respects excel him in others.

For the kind (*jins*) of (aspiration) to which they dedicate themselves, and the aim which they are pursuing are within the orbit of human possibilities and are of a type mankind can match. So everybody shoots here with one arrow and obtains one dart. And then the arrows reach different marks and (the bowmen) are unequal (in their achievements). They come near (the aim) in proportion to their familiarity with the technical devices (*ṣanā'i'*) and their share in the resources of the craft. The composition of the Qur'ān, (however), is a thing apart and a special process not to be equalled, free of rivals. If you wish to realize the grandeur (of the Qur'ān) reflect on what we are going to say in this chapter on Imru'ulqais (with respect to) his best poem, and on what we shall explain in detail to you about his defects.¹⁴

13. Cf. the analogous use of *κάλλη*, as in "Longinus," *On the Sublime* V, 1 τὰ κάλλη τῆς ἐρμηνείας, the beauties of style, *et al.*

For the use of *maḥāsīn* as applied to poetry, cf. Jamīl 92.2:

"I have composed on the subject of my love and my passion for you beautiful poetry (*maḥāsīn šir*) whose recording would be long."

Similarly, Ta'lab, p. 201³, uses *maḥāsīn* as "good points, virtues" of a verse. Only Ibn al-Mu'tazz appears to have assigned the word a more strictly technical meaning.

14. As this is not the place to present a critical translation of the *mu'allāqa* of Imru'ulqais the commentary has been limited to such explanations as will—so it is hoped—enable the reader to understand fully al-Bāqillānī's line of thought. The *mu'allāqa* is perhaps the most referred to poem in all Arabic literature. From the impressive array of critical observations by the Arabs on this masterpiece only a very few have been indicated with a view to placing al-Bāqillānī's opinions with greater precision within the framework of Arabic criticism. The most recent study of the *mu'allāqa* has been undertaken by S. Gandz, *SBWA*, phil.-hist. Kl., CLXX (1913), Abh. 4, which should be currently consulted.

Iṣarāf (d. 1067), criticizes Imru'ulqais sharply, pp. 326—28 and 330—32, with a view to helping the cause of the Moderns by running down the leading classical poet. His attacks on 48.11 and 14 are reminiscent of

ascribes to it a number of buttocks (*ardāfan kaṭīratan*) and a long-stretched backbone. (The critics) feel that this (figure of speech) contrasts with Abū Tammām's uncouth, unusual, objectionable metaphors and that the language is elegant. Know then that though it (really) is sound and elegant, it does not belong to the class which may be called extremely beautiful. There is a touch of constraint (in it) and it betrays traces of toilsome artificiality.

(The critics further) select as original (*badī'*) from the *qaṣīda*:

47. "And often did I ride forth in the morning, while the birds were still in their nests, on a smooth-haired (*munjarid*) steed, a chain for the wild game, (high like a) palace,"⁹⁵

48. persistent (or: quick) in attack and flight, exhibiting front and back at the same time, like a bulky rock hurled down by a torrent from on high."

And again:

54. "It has the flanks of a gazelle, the legs of an ostrich, the rapid gait (*irhā'*) of a wolf, and the gallop of a young fox."⁹⁶

His phrase *qaid al-awābid* (a chain for the wild game) is pretty (*maḥīh*). Similar expressions occur frequently in the language of the poets and of the eloquent, and it is possible (for everybody) to manufacture something like it. Our contemporaries achieve compositions of the same kind and invent beautiful figures of speech (*maḥāsin*) and embellish with them their diction. The earlier poets due to their proficiency and mastery had no need to have recourse to artifice in order to achieve this; it occurred to them quite naturally and in agreement with common usage. In his descriptive attributes *mikarr mifarr* (persistent, or: quick, in attack and flight) (Imru'ulqais) combines antithesis (*ṭibāq*) and comparison (*tašbīh*). On the horse's speed there are more beautiful and attractive (*alṭaf*) passages in poetry. There is real craftsmanship (*ṣan'a*) in his combining four comparisons in one verse (vs. 54), but he has found rivals and competitors. It is easy to equal him (in excellence) and to reach him is simple and no special achievement.

We have explained to you that this *qaṣīda* and those like it obviously exhibit in their various verses discrepancies in regard to their excellence, corruption (*radā'a*), easiness of elocution, intricacy (*in'iqād*), soundness,

95. This verse is also quoted *I'jāz*, p. 72 (this translation, p. 5).

96. Ḥalaf al-Aḥmar, quoted *Ḥayawān*, III, 15, praises the verse (also quoted *I'jāz*, p. 74 [this translation, p. 10]) for its comprehensiveness; *Ši'r*, p. 55, lauds it for the beauty of the similes, *Qurāda*, p. 17, for the apt comparison of four elements to four other elements. 'Umda, I, 259, quotes Qudāma who considers the verse as containing the best *tašbīh* ever found in Arabic poetry.

looseness (or: weakness, of composition; *inhilâl*), solidity (of texture; *tamakkun*), ease (*tasahhul*), carelessness (*istirsâl*), uncouthness (*tawassuh*), and general loathsomeness (*istikrâh*). (Imru'ulqais) has associates in (composing) poems like this (*qasîda*), (the *qasîda* itself) has competitors in its features of beauty (*maḥâsin*), and rivals in its innovations (*badâ'i'*). There is no comparison between diction which at one time splits a rock, and at another time melts away, changes color like a chameleon, varies like passions, whose grammatical construction teems with confusion, (P. 148) and whose motives make it vile; and on the other hand a diction that in spite of all its intricacies of thought proceeds in perfect order, whose structure is consistently even, whose formation is harmonious, and which is uniformly pure, splendid and brilliant (i.e., the style of the Qur'ân). Its heterogeneity is homogeneous (*muhtalifu-hu mu'talif*), its homogeneity is oneness (*muttaḥad*), what seems remote in it is near, its original elements are familiar, and again what seems familiar is original (*ṣârid/muṭî'*). And (the style of the Qur'ân) is uniform (*wâḥid*) despite its variety, and cannot be considered difficult in any case nor obscure in any respect.

We intended to deal with a number of famous *qasîdas* to discuss them, to point out their motives (*ma'ânî*) and features of beauty (*maḥâsin*) and to mention to you their merits and defects, and we meant to speak to you at some length about this subject (*jins*) and to open for you this road. Afterwards we understood this to be outside the scope of our book as the discussion thereof pertains to the criticism of poetry (*naqd aṣ-ṣi'r*) and its control by balance and touch-stone. On that subject there exist books, though they are not exhaustive, and compositions though they may not fathom (their subject). And this much suffices in our book.

We did not want to copy for you what the literary specialists (*udabâ'*) have written about the defects of Imru'ulqais in prosody, syntax, and motives (*ma'ânî*), and what has been criticized in his poems, and what (passages) of his *dîwân* have been discussed, for this, too, is alien to the aim of our book and outside of its purpose. We wanted to explain no more than we actually did, (just enough) to make you realize that the way of poetry is a well-trodden road and a much visited abode. Those who deal with it take from it according to their means and obtain from it in proportion to their circumstances. You find that the earlier (poet) employs motives for which a later (poet) has substituted something better inspired by the earlier poet; you find the later poet in possession of motives which an earlier poet had neglected. And again you find motives which occur to both of them together, so as to make of them two companions at one bridle, or two sucklings on one breast. And God gives His favor to whomever He pleases.

PART III

CRITICISM OF AL-BUḤTURÎ

Verily, he who compares the Qur'ân with the poetry of Imru'ulqais is farther astray than the "ass of his folk,"¹ and more stupid than Habannaqa.² Even if all of his poetry were like the select verses quoted by us, we would still have to disclaim all appreciation of his verse:³

"Many an aged (wild bull) resplendent like the *sunnaiq* and many an antelope have I roused (lit.: terrified) with a prancing (horse; *nahûd*) which starts running in mid-day heat."

Al-Aṣma'î said: I do not know what are: *as-sinn* (aged bull), *as-sunnaiq*, and *as-sunnam* (antelope). Somebody (else, however), remarked: *as-sunnaiq* is a hill.⁴

In (the same *qaṣida* Imru'ulqais) says:⁵

"He has the (short) ribs of an onager, and the legs of an ostrich, he is like a noble Caesarean stallion, prone to bite (*adûd*)."

(Equally objectionable is) his verse:⁶

"Like sparrows and flies and worms, and more daring than the greediness of wolves."

And our rejection (*taqbîḥ*) is strengthened by what follows in other verses of (the same poem):⁷

"And I have travelled far and wide in the lands under the sun, until coming home satisfied me more than booty.

And my aspiration was directed towards every noble trait and thus my merit grew."

1. This is probably an allusion to Mutalammis, *Dîwân*, ed. K. Vollers, Leipzig, 1903, 12.1: *himâr al-qaum*.

2. A fabled personage proverbial for his simplicity; cf. G. W. Freytag, *Arabum Proverbia*, Bonn, 1838—43, I, 392—93: *aḥmaq min Habannaqa*. See also *Bayân*, II, 190—91, and *GAL*, Suppl., I, 61.

3. 35.22. *Tawîl*.

4. Cf. Yâqût, III, 471, with reference to this verse. The condemnation of the verse is probably based on dislike of rare words as well as on disapproval of alliteration. For the attitude hostile to alliteration cf. e.g. the recurrent criticism of al-Aṣâ's line, 6.37b, whose sequence of adjectives beginning with *š* is objected to, amongst others, by Ši'r, p. 12 (see also below, *I'jâz*, p. 171; this trans., p. 86, and note 19). 'Abîd 1.6b, with its three alliterative *š* appears, however, to have escaped censure.

5. 35.16.

6. 5.2. *Wâfir*.

7. 5.9,8.

We are equally affected by what he says in (another) *qaṣīda*, extremely worthless (*fī nihāyat as-suqūṭ*):⁸

“At times when her mouth, whenever I awakened her from sleep, was like musk, diffusing its perfume, retained in the straining-cloth (*faddām*).⁹

Behold their litters travelling in the morn, like palm-trees of Šaukân at harvest-time.

As though the tongue of him who drinks (the wine to which the girl's saliva has been likened) were touching wax (*mām*) that infects his body with disease.”¹⁰

Likewise by his verse:¹¹ (S. 171)

“They do not act like Ḥanzala's clan. For their decision at their council was indeed evil!

No Ḥimyarite keeps his pledge and no ‘Udas, any more than the buttocks of a wild ass rubbed sore by the crupper.

Verily, the Banû ‘Auf had built up a reputation for themselves which the intruders ruined when they committed treason.”

Likewise by his verse:¹²

“Announce to Šihâb, nay, rather announce to ‘Âṣim: has the news of Mâlik reached you?

Verily, we left you behind (in the field) slain, wounded, captive, like demons.

(The captives) walk between our saddles, subservient, but neither hungry nor emaciated.”¹³

8. 59.6,7,11. *Kâmil*. The poet is reminiscing of days bygone. In vs. 5b he refers to the time when she captivated him with radiant, smiling teeth.

9. Musk was added to the wine but removed before drinking by filtering the wine through a straining-cloth. On the addition of musk, cf. e.g., A. von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte des Orients unter den Chalifen*, Vienna, 1875—77, I, 141; G. Jacob, *Altarabisches Beduinenleben*, p. 102; R. Geyer, *SBWA*, phil.-hist. Kl., CIL (1905), Abh. 6, pp. 91—2. Of verses alluding to the practice Zuhair l. 32 and ‘Abîd 5.13 may be mentioned as characteristic instances. The straining-cloth is discussed by R. Geyer, *SBWA*, phil.-hist. Kl., CXCI (1919), Abh. 3, pp. 151—54, where numerous references will be found.

10. It may not be without interest to note that al-Mubarrad, *Epistle*, *Orientalia*, n.s., X (1941), 377, praises highly vss. 3 and 4 of the same poem.

11. 27.3,4,1. *Munsariḥ*. Vs. 3b follows the translation offered by G. Olinder, *The Kings of Kinda*, Lund and Leipzig, 1927, p. 87.

12. 53.1—3. *Rajaz*.

13. It deserves notice that in this *rajaz* poem the two *miṣrâ‘* of the individual lines do not rhyme.

Slips like these are not confined to him alone. Al-A'sà composed (a number of objectionable verses such as):¹⁴

"May Allāh let you enter the coolness of Paradise, cheerful, in an auspicious way!"

Al-A'sà also said:¹⁵

"While his eye was heedless I shot at his ewe and I hit the center of her heart and her spleen."

He has said about his horse:¹⁶

"He orders lucern for (his stallion) al-Yahmûm every evening and lets him be supplied with so much barley that he nearly ruins his digestion."¹⁷

He has further said:¹⁸

"(A cook who) roasts meat, handy, active, agile, quick in service." All these words have the same meaning.¹⁹

To Zuhair a similar thing happened in his verse:²⁰

"And I took a serious oath by the stations of Minā and by the place where foreheads and lice are scraped off."

How could this be mentioned in a *qaṣīda* in which (the poet) says:²¹

"Is there anything that would let *ḥaṭṭī* (lances)²² grow unless it be the roots (of the ash-tree)? Are palm-trees planted anywhere outside of their proper soil?"

Likewise (open to objection) is the verse of aṭ-Ṭirimmāḥ:²³ (P. 172)

"Surely then shall bring thee to Lamīsa a bold female camel which with her urine has ejected the semen of the stallion."

14. The verse actually is by an-Nâbiga 'l-Ja'dî. Cf. *Muwašṣaḥ*, p. 65, and the translation, *RSO*, XIV (1933/34), 411, by M. Nallino. *Mutaqārib*.

15. Al-A'sà, ed. R. Geyer, 3.7; trans. by Geyer, *SBWA*, phil.-hist. Kl., CXCI (1919), Abh. 3, p. 75. *Kāmil*.

16. 33.16. *Tawīl*.

17. Al-Yahmûm was a famous horse belonging to an-Nu'mân b. al-Mundir, last king of al-Hīra, ca. 580—602; cf. G. L. Della Vida, *Les "Livres des Chevaux"* . . ., Leiden, 1928, p. 21 of Arabic text, where this verse is quoted.

18. 6.37b; trans. by Geyer, *op. cit.*, p. 15. *Basīṭ*.

19. As indicated above, note 4, *Ši'r*, p. 12, criticizes the line for its four needless synonyms. *Sin*, pp. 262—63, quotes it together with Imru'ulqais 35.16 and Muslim b. al-Walīd 5.15 (p. 47) as examples of bad *tajnīs*. Since all three verses abound in *s* and *š* phonetic dislike may have contributed to al-'Askarī's rejection. Āmidī, p. 116, also condemns A'sà 6.47b along with Imru'ulqais 35.22a in his discussion of bad *tajnīs*; and *Muwašṣaḥ*, p. 289, rejects Muslim 5.15 with considerable emphasis.

20. 14.6. *Tawīl*. On the vs. cf. T. Kowalski, *AO*, VI (1934), 72—3.

21. 14.41.

22. Cf. Schwarzlose, *op. cit.*, pp. 217—18.

23. 2.10; the translation is F. Krenkow's. *Ḥaṭṭī*. The poet died ca. 723.

as-sabantât: the strong female camel; *al-kirâd*: the semen of the stallion. She lets the semen of the stallion flow out together with the urine. So she had not refused him (as she would have done if she had been pregnant), nor had she conceived and thus been weakened. *al-mâ'ir*: the flowing.

If anybody should say: I find that you are dealing severely with Imru'ulqais and that you are of the opinion that he vacillates between the smooth and the rough, the pleasant and the harsh, the unfamiliar and the familiar, the obvious and the remote; that you further think that balanced diction is the best and succinct composition the most perfect; and that you, thus, deem al-Buḥturî superior in this racetrack, surpassing everybody by far in all these respects; and that you are aware that the scribes (*kuttâb*) prefer his diction (*kalâm*) to every other and place his opinion on eloquence (*balâġa*) above every other opinion; that, similarly, you detect in Abû Nuwâs splendor of diction and subtlety of ideas which stun even experts of rhetoric and which men of subtle taste and of wit prefer to every other poet, because they attribute to his composition such elegance (*rau'a*) as they do not attribute to anybody else, and such ornateness (*zibriġ*) as has not been attained by anyone apart from him: If this be so, how can the superiority of any other literary composition (i.e., primarily that of the Qur'ân) be recognized?

The answer is: The discussion (of the fact) that it is not permissible to weigh the Qur'ân against poetry has preceded.²⁴ There we have shown the literary character of the poetry of Imru'ulqais. He is the greatest of all (the poets); on his superiority they all insist. He is their *šaiĥ*, whose excellence they all acknowledge, their leader whom they all imitate, and their *imâm* to whom they all resort. We have further demonstrated that the rank of his poetry is inferior to the rank which must be accorded to the composition of the Qur'ân, and that he could not admix with his poetry (even as much as) the dust of that composition (i.e., of the Qur'ân). When you consider these things he becomes just as it has been said:²⁵

"And in the morning I became to Lailâ like one who looks at the retreat of a star setting in the West at dawn."²⁶

24. In Part Two of this translation.

25. The poet is Majnûn Banî 'Âmir, Qais b. al-Mulawwah, love poet and hero of a celebrated love-story, d. ca. 689. His historicity has, however, been doubted; cf. *GAL*, Suppl., I, 81. Quotations: *Kâmil*, p. 166; *Aġânî*, I, 174 and 179; VIII, 172 (anon.); al-Ma'arrî, *Letters*, p. 8; Nuwairî, IV, 198; *IšajĤamâsa*, p. 156 (ascribed to Muḥammad b. an-Numairî); *MM*, p. 158. *Tawîl*.

26. In the same way, Imru'ulqais vanishes from the scene when his work is to be compared with the Qur'ân.

his poetry (*dībāja šī'ri-hi*), and place him above them because of the beauty of his mode of expression, the ease of his diction, the sweetness of his words, and the rare occurrence of obscurity (*ta'aqqud*) in his sayings, (we have to admit that) poetry (as such) is an attainment within human reach, capable of improvement (*mustadrak*) and rooted in human nature (*muntabi'*). The composition of the Qur'ân, however, is beyond human imagination (*wahm*) and thought (*fikr*), not to be learned nor to be coveted by anyone, (as stated in the Qur'ân itself): "Falsehood comes not to it (the Qur'ân) from before nor from behind: a revelation from One Wise and Praiseworthy."¹³²

I have already mentioned that—if you were versed in the art of mastering the language—you could obtain by yourself full insight into what we have discussed, and penetrate into what we have described. If (you do) not (possess this prerequisite), sit in the assembly of those who derive their opinions from other people (*al-muqallidîn*), and acquiesce in the decisions (*mawâqif*)¹³³ of the judges.¹³⁴ I advised you well when I told you: Consider whether you can discern the goldveins, the beauties of a jewel, the matchless qualities of a ruby, and the subtleties of witchcraft without proper knowledge of the prerequisites for such understanding. (Consider) further, whether you can cut your road through unknown countries without guidance. To every thing there is a road of access, a door through which it can be approached, and one side from which you may enter. The science (*ma'rifa*) of speech is harder than the knowledge of anything I have described to you, deeper, subtler (*adaqq*), and more delicate (*altaf*).

(The same applies) to the presentation of thoughts and the exposition of emotions so that you may know them and so to speak see them, even if it is done only by intimation (*išâra*). This may be achieved by mere allusion and hints just as well as by direct words and eloquent speech. The intimations again may be of various degrees (of ambiguity) and the language of several grades (of clarity). Many a description (*wasf*) depicts for you the subject described exactly as it is without leaving any room for dissent; many a description, on the other hand, adds something to the subject and exceeds its reality or falls short of it. Further, if the description is true to its subject, it may be classified according to (categories such as) correctness and perfection, beauty and embellishment, summarizing and detailed presentation (*ijmâl wa-šarḥ*), exhaustive and approximate reproduction (of its subject; *istifâ' wa-*

132. Qur'ân 41.42.

133. For the semantic development cf. the French *arrêt*.

134. Read: *al-mutaḥayyirîna* for *al-mutaḥayyirîna*.

taqrîb),¹³⁵ and the like. And every manner of style has its door and its path (of access).

(To give some examples), a presentation of the entire subject without commentary is His word: "If one had observed them he could have turned from them in flight, and been filled because of them with dread."¹³⁶ A presentation with commentary (i.e., detail; *tafsîr*) is His word: "On the day when We shall cause the mountains to move, and one will see the earth stepping forward, and We shall round them up and leave of them not one;"¹³⁷ up to the last verse on this subject.¹³⁸ Similarly His word: "Oh ye people, show piety towards your Lord; verily the quake of the Hour (P. 192) is a mighty thing. (2) On the day when ye see it, every suckling female will forget what she has suckled, and every pregnant female will cast her burden, and one will think the people drunk, though they are not drunk; but the punishment of Allâh is severe."¹³⁹ This is a passage portraying the subject in its reality and picturing (*yumattilu*) the terrors of that Day.

Passages illustrating to you the technique of describing a subject by means of describing its secondary symptoms (*ṣifa*) are His words in the tale of the wizards when Pharaoh threatened them following their profession of belief (in Allâh): "(They, i.e., the wizards, said:) It does not matter, surely we are going back to our Lord. (51) We surely hope that our Lord may forgive us our sins on account of our being the first to believe."¹⁴⁰ Similarly He said in another place (in the same connection): "(Said they:) 'Verily to our Lord are we turning; (123) And thou takest vengeance upon us only because we have believed in the signs of our Lord when they came to us; Oh our Lord, pour out upon us patience and call us in as Muslims.'"¹⁴¹ This indicates the state of mind of the afflicted by telling what has befallen him and of the calamity-stricken by telling what has smitten him.

The subject of subduing (*tashîr*) and creating (*takwîn*) is illustrated by His sayings: "All that He needs to do, when He wishes a thing, is to say to it: 'Be!' and it is."¹⁴² And: "So We said to them: 'Be ye apes

135. Dozy, *op. cit.*, II, 322, has *qarraba* in the sense of "narrating in detail." The above translation was chosen because of the preceding *ṣarḥ*.

136. *Qur'ân* 18.17.

137. *Qur'ân* 18.45.

138. Probably vs. 47.

139. *Qur'ân* 22.1,2.

140. *Qur'ân* 26.50,51. Here the character of the converted wizards is described not by the appropriate adjectives but indirectly through their words and actions.

141. *Qur'ân* 7.122,123.

142. *Qur'ân* 36.82.

slinking away.'"¹⁴³ And: "Then We suggested to Moses: 'Strike with thy staff the sea;' and it clave asunder; each part became like a cliff mighty."¹⁴⁴

An exhaustive treatment of all the ramifications would be too long and I never did intend to give a complete account. I have only given you one example in order to let you draw inferences from it, and what I have pointed out to you was done in order to enable you to consider (the whole complex).

We have confined ourselves to an analysis of al-Buḥturî's *qaṣida* because the secretaries (*kuttâb*) prefer him to his contemporaries and accord to him precedence over all the poets of his century. Among them there are some who in gross exaggeration (*guluwwan*) claim for al-Buḥturî the *i'jâz*, and contend that in his work he has risen to the stars. The heretics seek support in his poetry and make ample use of it. They also claim that his sayings are equivocal like their own utterances, and that his expressions are of the same texture as their own idle talk. Therefore we have clarified his rank and standing as well as the limitations of his work (*kalâm*). What a far cry there is between that to which man may aspire and what he must renounce in despair (i.e., the poetry of al-Buḥturî and the Qur'ân), between night and day, vanity and truth, the word of the Lord of the Worlds and the word of man.

143. Qur'ân 2.61.

144. Qur'ân 26.63.

SYNOPTIC TABLE OF

Note: The figures following the terms indicate their position within their respective systems.

As Ibn al-Mu'tazz divides the figures of speech in forms of *badʿ* and *maḥāsīn* numbers referring to *maḥāsīn* will be preceded by M.

	I-JĀZ	AL-ʿASKARI	BADIʿ
1	<i>istiʿāra</i>	<i>istiʿāra</i> ¹	<i>istiʿāra</i> ¹
2	<i>irdāf</i>	<i>al-ardāf waʿt-tawābi</i> ⁸	
3	<i>tašbīḥ</i>	<i>tašbīḥ</i>	<i>ḥusn at-tašbīḥ</i> ^{M11}
4	<i>guluww</i>	<i>guluww</i> ¹⁰	
5	<i>mumāṭala</i>	<i>mumāṭala</i> ⁹	
6	<i>muṭābaga</i>	<i>muṭābaga</i> ²	<i>muṭābaga</i> ³
7	<i>tajnis</i>	<i>tajnis</i> ³	<i>tajnis</i> ²
8	<i>muqābala</i>	<i>muqābala</i> ⁴	
9	<i>muwāzana</i>		
10	<i>musāwāt</i>		
11	<i>išāra</i>	<i>išāra</i> ⁷	
12	<i>mubālaḡa (de guluww)</i>	<i>mubālaḡa</i> ¹¹	<i>ifrāṣ fi ʿ-ṣifa</i> ^{M10}
13	<i>igāl</i>	<i>igāl</i> ¹⁶	
14	<i>tauṣīḥ</i>	<i>tauṣīḥ</i> ¹⁷	
15	<i>radd ʿajz al-kalām ʿalā ṣadri-hi</i>	<i>radd al-ʿajz ʿalā ʿ-ṣadri</i> ¹⁸	<i>radd al-ʿajz ʿalā ʿ-ṣadr</i> ⁴
16	<i>ṣiḥḥat at-taqṣīm</i> ^B	<i>ṣiḥḥat at-taqṣīm</i> ⁵	
17	<i>ṣiḥḥat at-tafsīr</i>	<i>ṣiḥḥat at-tafsīr</i> ⁶	
18	<i>at-takmil waʿt-tatmīm</i>	<i>at-takmil waʿt-tatmīm</i> ¹⁹	
19	<i>tarṣīʿ</i>	<i>tarṣīʿ</i> ¹⁵	
20	<i>at-tarṣīʿ maʿ at-tajnis</i>		
21	<i>muḍāraʿa</i>		
22	<i>takāfuʿ</i>		
23	<i>taʿaffuf</i>	<i>taʿaffuf</i> ³²	
24	<i>as-salb waʿl-ijāb</i>	<i>as-salb waʿl-ijāb</i> ²⁶	
25	<i>al-kināya waʿt-taʿrīḡ</i>	<i>al-kināya waʿt-taʿrīḡ</i> ¹²	<i>at-taʿrīḡ waʿl-kināya</i> ^{M9}
26	<i>lahn al-qawīl</i>		
27	<i>al-ʿaks waʿt-tabdīl</i>	<i>ʿaks</i> ^{13C}	
28	<i>iltifāt</i>	<i>iltifāt</i> ²⁰	<i>iltifāt</i> ^{M1}
29	<i>ʿitirāḡ</i>	<i>ʿitirāḡ</i> ²¹	<i>ʿitirāḡ</i> ^{M2}
30	<i>rujūʿ</i>	<i>rujūʿ</i> ²²	<i>rujūʿ</i> ^{M3}
31	<i>taḡyīl</i>	<i>taḡyīl</i> ¹⁴	
32	<i>istiṭrād</i>	<i>istiṭrād</i> ²⁴	<i>ḥusn al-ḥurūḡ</i> ^{M4}
33	<i>takrār</i>		<i>madḥ bi-mā yuṣbiḥu ʿd-gamm</i> ^{M5}
34	<i>istiṭnāʿ</i>	<i>istiṭnāʿ</i>	

FIGURES OF SPEECH

Maḥāsīn lists two different sets of terms; the first comprises expressions applicable in describing prose (pp. 72—79), the second expressions applicable to poetry (pp. 94—96). Terms taken from the second set will here be preceded by "II," e.g., II 7.

MAFĀTIḤ	QUDĀMA	NN
<i>istiʿāra</i> ^{8, II 2}	<i>irdāf</i> ¹¹	<i>istiʿāra</i> ⁶
<i>irdāf</i> ¹⁸	<i>tašbīḥ</i> ^{1A}	<i>tašbīḥ</i> ¹
<i>tašbīḥ</i> ^{II 1}	<i>tamīl</i> ¹²	
<i>muḍābaga</i> ^{7, II 4}	<i>al-muṭābiq</i> ¹³	
<i>muḡānasa</i> ^{4, II 3}	<i>al-muḡānis</i> ¹⁴	
<i>muḡābala</i> ^{9, 10, II 4}	<i>ṣiḥḥat al-muḡābala</i> ³	
	<i>fasād al-muḡābalāḡ</i> ¹⁵	
<i>(musāwāt</i> ²³ <i>)</i> ^A	<i>musāwāt</i> ^{9A}	
	<i>išāra</i> ¹⁰	<i>išāra</i> (subcategory of <i>waḥy</i>) ⁵
<i>mubālaḡa</i> ¹⁷	<i>mubālaḡa</i> ⁶	<i>mubālaḡa</i> ¹¹
	<i>igāl</i> ¹⁶	
	<i>tauṣīḥ</i> ¹⁵	
<i>taqṣīm</i> ^{14, 15}	<i>ṣiḥḥat at-taqṣīm</i> ² /fasād	
<i>ḡadal & fasād at-tafsīr</i> ^{11, 12}	<i>al-aḡsām</i> ¹⁷	
<i>tatmīm</i> ¹³ , <i>itmām</i> ^{II 14}	<i>ṣiḥḥat at-tafsīr</i> ⁴ /fasād	
<i>tarṣīʿ</i> ^{II 11}	<i>at-tafsīr</i> ¹⁹	
<i>muḍāraʿa</i> ⁵	<i>tatmīm</i> ⁵	
<i>mukāfāʿa</i> ^{7, II 4}		
	<i>takāfuʿ</i> ⁷	
<i>tabdīl</i> ¹⁶		
<i>ʿitirāḡ</i> ^{II 6}		
<i>ʿitirāḡ</i> ^{II 7}	<i>iltifāt</i> ⁸	
<i>rujūʿ</i> ^{II 8}		
<i>takrār</i> ²¹		<i>lahn</i> ³

A Not listed as a figure of speech.

B *I'jâz* refers to *ḥusn at-taqṣīm* also between *tašbīh* and *ḡuluww*.

C al-ʿAskarī also records the term *tabdīl* as used by some.

Additional remarks.

(A) Of the figures omitted by the *I'jâz* the following are shared by two or more of the authors analysed in the above table:

- (1) *al-maḍhab al-kalāmī*: al-ʿAskarī²⁸, *Mafâtîḥ*^{II 5}, *Badīʿ*⁵;
- (2) *tajāḥul al-ʿarīf*: al-ʿAskarī²³, *Badīʿ*⁶;
- (3) *i'nât*: *Badīʿ*^{M 12}, *Mafâtîḥ*^{II 10}.

(B) In addition, the following figures are recorded by only one of the authors:

- (I) By al-ʿAskarī: (1) *jamʿ al-muʿtalif waʿl-muḥtalif*²⁵
 (2) *taštīr*²⁹
 (3) *mujāwara*³⁰
 (4) *al-istiḥād waʿl-iḥtijāj*³¹
 (5) *mudāʿafa*³³
 (6) *taṭrīz*³⁴
 (7) *talattuf*³⁵
- (II) By *Mafâtîḥ*: (1) *tasmīt*
- (III) By *Badīʿ*: (1) *al-hazl yurādu bihi ʿl-jadd*^{M 7}
 (2) *ḥusn at-taḍmīn*^{M 8}
 (3) *ḥusn al-ibtidāʿāt*^{M 13}
- (IV) By Qudāma, NN (1) *istiḡāq*¹
 (2) *ramz*⁴
 (3) *wahy*⁵
 (4) *amtāl*⁷
 (5) *luḡz*⁸
 (6) *ḥaḍf*⁹
 (7) *ṣarf*¹⁰
 (8) *qaṭʿ*¹²
 (9) *ʿatf*¹³
 (10) *taqdīm*¹⁴
 (11) *taʿhīr*¹⁵
 (12) *iḥtirāʿ*¹⁶

(C) Rummânî lists the following as elements, *aqsām*, of *balāḡa*:

- (1) *ʾijâz*, concision;
- (2) *tašbīh*
- (3) *istiʿāra*
- (4) *talāʾum*, harmony
- (5) *al-fawāṣil*, rhythmization
- (6) *tajānūs*
- (7) *taṣrīf*, "variation," i.e. a. use of derivatives from the same root;
 b. restating the same content in a slightly varied manner;
- (8) *taḍmīn*, implication;¹
- (9) *mubālaḡa*

1. *Itqān*, II, 56³¹⁻³⁴, quotes Bâqillânî for a similar usage of *taḍmīn*, which is defined as a sub-category of *ʾijâz*.

- (10) (*ḥusn al-*) *bayân*, precise (and pleasing) rendition of the idea.
- (D) The process of classification progressed rather slowly during the century following Bâqillânî's death as witness the list of figures in *Qânûn*, pp. 435—59. Here Abû Tâhir (d. 1123), who follows Qudâma in his approach to the *badî'*, records among 42 terms only five beyond those referred to by the authors analysed in the Table. These terms are: *tashîm*, *tashîf*, *ḥusn at-taḥalluṣ*, *taṣrî'* and *qasam*. Most of them are traceable in earlier writers but outside of the sections especially devoted to *badî'*.
- (E) In judging the *Naqd aš-ši'r* it must be remembered that Qudâma does not treat *badî'* as a separate section but lists what other authors consider to be figures of speech during his discussion of virtues and defects of poetical representation. He classifies those traits according as they inhere in the idea, the wording, both idea and wording, the poetical form as such, and so forth. As a consequence of this approach a number of his categories such as *istiḡrâb*, *al-istiḥâla wa't-tanâquḍ*, and *ḥašw* are not of the same order as those defined or observed by the other theorists and have therefore been excluded from tabulation.